REPORT OF

1960 ANNUAL CONFERENCE

March 24 - 25, 1960

Burlington, Vermont

REPORT OF STATE ASC CONFERENCE

Vermont State and County Committeemen, County Office Managers, County Agents, and Guests

Held at Hotel Vermont, Burlington, Vermont, March 24 and 25, 1960

Foreword

This report presents the talks and committee reports of the 1960 State ASC Conference. Those attending the two-day conference considered the farmer thinking back home as shown at the recent county program planning meetings and used this information in the working committees of the conference. Their recommendations will serve as a guide for the work of the Vermont Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Office during the coming program year.

The recommendations included in this report are those which were approved by the entire conference. The recommendations affecting the 1961 ACP have been reviewed and considered by the Vermont State ASC Committee, in a joint meeting with other agricultural agency representatives at the State level, and were the basis of the State Committee's recommendations to the Washington Office.

At this same joint meeting the State Committee reviewed county committee ideas in connection with the Conservation Reserve Program and sent their recommendations along to the Washington Office for their consideration in formulating future programs.

We were honored to have Marvin L. McLain, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, as guest speaker at our banquet. Although disappointed that Governor Stafford could not attend because of a conflict, we were pleased to welcome Commissioner of Agriculture Elmer Towne and Mrs. Towne as his official representatives.

We appreciate a great deal the work and wholehearted cooperation of everyone who helped in any way to make our 1960 State ASC Conference a success.

State ASC Committee

Edson E. Gifford, Chairman
Howard A. Foster, Vice Chairman
Clyde H. Bryant, Member
Robert P. Davison, Ex Officio

State ASC Office

A. F. Heald, Administrative Officer
C. B. Doane, Fieldman
G. T. Hart, Fieldman

CONFERENCE THEME

VERMONT LEADS THE NATION

Vermont leads the Nation in terms of the farm acres that participate in the ACP program. Vermont's record, 83%; National average, 33%.

This record has been accomplished through the work and interest of the committee system in Vermont.

We have just completed a series of meetings where all committeemen were given an opportunity to express their opinions on the ACP and CRP programs. This State Conference is called so that county committeemen may review these ideas and suggestions and make recommendations to the State Committee for the 1961 programs and their administration.

Each one of you should contribute your part. Remember you are to represent the thinking of the committeemen in your county.

PROGRAM

1960 STATE ASC CONFERENCE

March 24 and 25, 1960

HOTEL VERMONT, BURLINGTON, VERMONT

First Day

9:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m.	Register, get name tags and banquet tickets at Conference Registration Desk in Lobby	

Conference Opened by
Howard A. Foster, Presiding

10:00 a.m.	Conference Goals	Edson E. Gifford, Chairman, State ASC Committee
10:15 a.m.	My Job as an Ex Officio Member of the County ASC Committee	Ralph C. McWilliams, Franklin County Agent
11:15 a.m.	Some Challenges to ACP for 1961	Paul M. Koger, Administrator, ACPS
12:15 p.m.	Committee Assignments	Howard A. Foster, Vice-Chairman, State ASC Committee

A. ACP Program Planning - Parlor B

B. CRP and Administrative Problems - Apple Orchard

C. County Office Managers' Session on Administration - Parlor A

12:30 p.m.	Lunch
1:30 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.	Conference Committee Meetings

CONFERENCE BANQUET

March 24, 1960

6:30 p. m.

Roof Garden

Toastmaster - Charles L. Winslow, Sr.

PROGRAM

Recognition

Musical Selections

Guest Speaker - Marvin L. McLain
Assistant Secretary
of Agriculture

Awards

Second Day

Clyde H. Bryant, Presiding

9:00 a.m.	Holding Better County Committee Meetings	
	Introduction of subject by	Charles B. Doane, Fieldman
	A. Preparation and Use of Agenda	Edla Browne, Addison County Office Manager
	B. Preparing Reference Materials for Meetings	Louise Rand, Orange County Office Manager
	C. Keeping County Committee Meetings on the Subject	Stuart Newton, Chairman, Franklin County Committee
	D. Preparation and Use of Minutes	Bethany French, Rutland County Office Manager

Second Day (Continued)

10:00 a.m.	Control and Use of ACP Funds	A. F. Heald, State Admin. Officer
	Discussion period with following panel members assisting:	
	Representative of State Committee	Howard A. Foster
	Representative of County Committees	Arthur Stancliff
	Representative of County Office Managers	John J. DeVito
11:00 a.m.	New Challenges to Committeemen	H. W. Soule Area Director (NE)
11:30 a.m.	Supply and Demand of Forest Tree Seedlings	A. W. Gottlieb State Forester
12:00 noon	Lunch	

Edson E. Gifford, Presiding

1:30 p.m.	Report of Committee on ACP Program Planning	Howard A. Foster Chairman
	Discussion - Changes - Adoption	
2:15 p.m.	Report of Committee on CRP and Administrative Problems	Clyde H. Bryant Chairman
	Discussion - Changes - Adoption	
3:00 p.m.	Plans for Getting State Committee Nominations	Edson E. Gifford Chairman, State ASC Committee
3:20 p.m.	Summary of Conference	A. F. Heald, State Administrative Officer
3:30 p.m.	Adjourn	

Conference Committee Assignments

I. ACP PROGRAM PLANNING COMMITTEE

Howard A. Foster, Chairman

F. Milo Leighton, Vice Chairman

C. B. Doane, Secretary

COUNTY	COUNTY COMMITTEEMEN	COUNTY AGENTS FROM
Addison	Fenwick Estey	Addison
Dennington	Robert Graf*	
Caledonia	Norman Lowe	Caledonia
Chittenden	Ray Collins	
Essex	Mrs. Mildred Hook*	Essex
Franklin	Floyd C. Weld	
Grand Isle	Chester Caswell Jay Haylett	Grand Isle
Lamoille	Arthur Stancliff Ray C. Perkins	
Orange	F. Milo Leighton Glenn A. Webster	
Orleans	Robert P. Kilborn** Allen Nelson*	Orleans
Rutland	George H. Ridlon George Livak	
Washington	D. Drew Bisbee Everett Walbridge	Washington
Windham	Robert E. Gaines Arthur Bensenhaver	
Windsor	Raymond Farrar	Windsor

*Substituting for regular committeeman
**Attended conference banquet

II. CRP AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEMS COMMITTEE

Clyde H. Bryant, Chairman

Reginald LeBlanc, Vice Chairman

A. F. Heald, Secretary

COUNTY	COUNTY COMMITTEEMEN	COUNTY AGENTS FROM
Addison	Robert C. Highter Frank Phelps*	
Bennington	Everett Lillie*	Bennington
Caledonia	George Ricker* Clarence Burrington	
Chittenden	Gay Baldwin Raymond Rowley	Chittenden
Essex	Roland Devost* John Boswell	
Franklin	Stuart Newton Roland Gervais	Franklin
Grand Isle	Alan Kinney	
Lamoille	Lawrence Gregory	Lamoille
Orange	Walter Wheatley	Orange
Orleans	Henry Dagesse Reginald LeBlanc	
Rutland	Roy Burroughs	Rutland
Washington	Emile Bordeaux	
Windham	Myron Allen	Windham
Windsor	Matthew Watson Raymond Bingham	

*Substituting for regular committeeman

CONFERENCE GOALS
by Edson E. Gifford, Chairman, Vermont State ASC Committee
At the Annual ASC Conference
Hotel Vermont, Burlington, Vermont
March 24, 1960

I am glad to welcome you folks here at our State Conference this morning. It doesn't seem possible that another year has rolled around. It has been a busy year. You committeemen and office managers have had many new challenges and, by and large, you have met them well. The proof that you have met them is brought about by the fact that Vermont leads the Nation in ACP participation.

As we state on the inside cover of our conference program, "Vermont leads the Nation in terms of the farm acres that participate in the ACP program. Vermont's record, 83%; National average, 33%. This record has been accomplished through the work and interest of the committee system in Vermont.

"We have just completed a series of meetings where all committeemen were given an opportunity to express their opinions on the ACP and CRP programs. This State Conference is called so that county committeemen may review these ideas and suggestions and make recommendations to the State Committee for the 1961 programs and their administration. Each one of you should contribute your part. Remember you are to represent the thinking of the committeemen in your county."

For you who are serving on the ACP Program Planning Committee

We didn't come up with too many new ideas at our county meetings, but I think it is up to you people serving on this committee to take a good look at some of our present systems to see if they cannot be improved. We should make an analysis of how we are spending our money and be sure we are headed in the right direction. You should review the systems used in our State for controlling funds and see if they can be improved. You should make sure that we can justify the practices we are offering during this time of plentiful food supplies; if we can, fine; if we can't, recommend changes. I see your job as one of a working committee to make recommendations for changes in practices and programs at the National level and to make suggestions to your State Committee for operating the program during the coming year in Vermont.

CRP and Administrative Problems Committee

We have now one more year of experience behind us on the Conservation Reserve Program. We don't know right now what kind of a 1961 program will be authorized by Congress but, assuming that we have the same authority in 1961, we want you folks to analyze the community committee recommendations, to take a look at program results to date, and to come up with your suggestions for program and administrative improvements for the year ahead.

Office Managers

The separate session for office managers has again been scheduled this year. The managers have told us they want it this way. We have a good group of managers in Vermont. They have been with us a long while and they have done a good job. We want them in their session today to take a look at some of the administrative detail and to come up with ideas on improving the job done.

Conclusion

I want to repeat what I have said before that the success of the committee work lies in the job done by every single one of you people. Don't wait for someone else to do it. Do your part -- be active today and tomorrow -- and help us to do a better job.

MY JOB AS AN EX-OFFICIO MEMBER OF THE COUNTY ASC COMMITTEE

Address by R. C. McWilliams
Franklin County Agent
at State ASC Conference
Burlington, Vermont, March 24-25, 1960

I see, Mr. Chairman, that I have been assigned an hour on your program this morning to talk on "My Job As An Ex-Officio Member of the County ASC Committee." The title is nearly as long as the talk might be, and I can't possibly use up that much time on this subject, so in case any other speaker needs more time or if you people need a break during the morning, I think there will be plenty of time available for it.

You all know, of course, that I have been closely associated - and most pleasantly so - with your program ever since it was first put into use way back in 1936, and have, so to speak, grown up with it over the twenty-four intervening and interesting years. The closeness of my association has varied considerably from year to year and has been largely geared to what appeared to be the situation at the time.

I don't know just when this Ex-Officio term worked into the picture -- perhaps it was always there, but if so it was largely ignored at some times. Recently I have tried to find out just what Ex-Officio means in terms of your ASC rules and regulations, but no one seems able to give me much help in a definition from your book of rules. I know it means "without vote." It may mean "without responsibility." I also suspect it means "without authority," and certainly I haven't ever needed to use authority, but I don't find that too hard to put up with; for many times before I have had jobs of one kind or another that involved "responsibility without authority." This situation can sometimes make life rather interesting, but it is not often that it gets to the point of serious complications. A more interesting talk to me would be one from a county committee member viewpoint on "How the Ex-Officio Member Works With Us."

I have assumed over the years, and largely because of the gradual evolution of the whole program, that my job, if such it should be called, was and is to contribute whenever asked and whenever reasonably practicable to making the whole operation as useful and as smoothly run as possible. So far, I have always found the job interesting and usually found it enjoyable. It has been no problem at all to work in harmony for a common goal with the committee members we have been fortunate in having in Franklin County.

Now, of course, I have always felt and still feel that in Franklin County we have been especially fortunate in having three things - first of all, a good farm county that really has needed and was willing and able to use the kind of practices available thru the Agricultural Conservation Program. Next, we have had an especially good group of men on our county and community committees over the years, and last but not least, we have had a hard-working and very competent office staff that has always seemed to me to regard their part in the program as an opportunity to help the farmers do a better job on their farms as well as a matter of keeping the office running on a good solid basis.

I don't know about other counties, but it has been a very gratifying thing to me to be associated so closely with the fine people who do carry the responsibility and the authority in Franklin County.

In looking back over what records I have on the beginning and the development of the whole program, I find that about April 1, 1936 (what a date to start) - on April 1, 1936, I was "loaned" more or less to help get the program rolling. It might appear that this was done through the Bureau of Agricultural Economics because I recently found among some old papers a set of fingerprints recorded as being for the files of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. I also vaguely remember somewhere that I took an oath of allegiance. Just why either of these was necessary I never knew, but since it didn't cost anything and didn't seem to affect what I was doing, I didn't object. In fact, having my fingerprints on record has always cheered me up because if I should ever happen to get lost or even merely mislaid, someone might be able to identify me more readily.

In looking back over my weekly reports to the Extension Service for 1936 and later years, I find that about half my time for some months after April, 1936 was reported under the heading of ACP. It didn't seem then to be so very Ex-Officio, but rather Officio, as at that time I was told to find and move into a separate office, and to find a secretary to handle the necessary details of getting the program under way.

Some of you no doubt remember the official reasons for it, but if I did once know them, I have forgotten after 24 years. As I recall, I just took it as one of the things passed on to County Agents during that depression period of stress and strain. I might just comment here that perhaps it has not always been for the selfish good of Extension to have the County Agents diverted to these seemingly emergency jobs rather than continuing on with carrying out the wording of the Smith Lever Act under which we operate, which is, as I recall and I quote, "to take to the people useful and practical information on subjects relating to agriculture and home economics and to encourage the application of the same." I repeat that last phrase "to encourage the application of the same." There are a lot of ways of doing that and that is the key to most of our work. But since Extension Agents have always had a better overall knowledge of their county and the people in it than anyone else, it has been only natural, whenever a particularly important job of organization came along, that the help or loan of the Agents through the Extension Service should be asked for and given. Among these, along with ACP, might be mentioned TB cleanups, relief gardens and other relief projects, wartime projects, SCD promotion and organizations, brucellosis cleanups, and others less important, perhaps, but still of some importance to the welfare of agriculture as a whole. I for one don't think I would have it otherwise and I feel it has helped more than it has hurt the Agricultural Extension Service. But it has at times seriously interfered with the real purpose as set forth in the Smith Lever Act.

Nowadays we talk a lot about getting projects "off the ground and into orbit" and helping do that has always been one of the County Agent's jobs - and most of us look at it as one of our normal services, although sometimes it comes nearer fitting in with my personal motto which is and I quote, "It seemed like a good idea at the time."

Needless to say, my association with the ACP was closer in its first years than it is today, not because I have less interest in it but because as it developed in the county, those on the county committee, on community committees, and the office staff needed less and less help such as they might expect from the County Agent.

Right here, I want to take a moment to pay tribute to those who have served on our county committee and in the office. I won't mention the community committeemen by name because there are so many and not because I have any less appreciation for their work. Our first county committeemen were Park Newton, Eugene Brosseau and Cromwell Bowen. Many of you knew them then and no one could ask for finer or more capable people with whom to work. Don't ask me how they were selected, I don't remember. As these men retired they were succeeded by such men as Russell Sunderland, who was one of the first local committeemen when local committeemen worked on an area basis. Another was Frank Myott who, besides Frank Branon and Park Newton, has been on your State Committee. Others who have served on our county committees and those serving now were and are equally competent. Developing leadership has always been what I have felt to be an important part of any County Agent's job and to be associated even Ex-Officio with ACP and to see so much good leadership develop from among the farm people of the county should keep all of us reminded that there is no lack of good men who wait only for a need or an opportunity to take their place. The leadership is there.

Anyway, at the start, Ex-Officio or otherwise, my job was a lot more demanding than it is now. I was at that time asked for suggestions as to committeemen to do the work prior to when the program reached the point of having community election meetings in each town. I organized meetings, at first on an area basis to explain the program and I put in time visiting farms with committeemen and helping them understand and interpret the practices and the farm work sheets used. It was also important at this time to help all those working on the program to have as complete as possible an understanding of the soils, crops, and general agricultural situation of the county.

While there has been a lot of change in the amount of my work with the county committee, Ex-Officio or otherwise, the general pattern has not changed too much in Franklin County. Perhaps it should have changed more and perhaps some of the things in which I have been involved should be dropped, but I will leave these decisions to the county committee.

I found in looking over my 1937 records, that we included in our program that year a tour of parts of the county for the purpose of getting committeemen better informed on soil types and soil needs. We have apparently some 50 to 60 soil types sufficiently different to be classified by the SCS. On that first tour, we attempted only to get the committeemen who attended informed about the general classifications of sands, loams, clays, their fertility and management needs. The most unique and I think helpful part of this first tour was a little excursion into the subsoils underlying these types and how they influenced the need for lime, fertilizers and cropping procedures. We have traveled a long way since that time, but there is still a very useful job to be done in going deeper into this. Of course to some extent, this area of farming has been taken over by another one of the agencies helped off the ground and into orbit by County Agents.

Sometimes over the years the county committee has said they would like to have a tour that year that would cover some particular things which they felt were important at that time and I have made it my job to arrange a tour that would meet their request. At other times, they have said "What can you work up this year for a useful tour?" And while that gave lots of latitude in which to operate, it may not always have been finally the most helpful tour. I don't think we have missed a year without a tour of some kind. In recent years they have been by bus and this of course has its greatly added value of not only bringing all community committeemen together for a better acquaintance with their fellow members but also an added feeling of the county as a unit. Since Walter Rockwood has been in Franklin County he also has had a part in arranging these tours, which have sometimes had most of the emphasis on practices under the ACP program and sometimes, as this past year, been planned to give a broader look at some agricultural problems. This past year, for instance, we went to Canada where we looked at a liquid manure handling operation, a land clearing and reclamation layout on a peculiar soil type, a dairy school and experimental farm and a very modern dairy cooperative. This was our first tour into Canada and a real eye-opener to many of those who went.

This arranging of tours is one of my jobs where it is rather hard to draw any line between my job as Ex-Officio committeeman and my job as County Agricultural Agent. In any event, I am satisfied that all our committeemen who take part in these tours are better informed and more enthusiastic in their work because of their participation and that they have gained useful and practical information.

Since the very inception of the program, part of my job as I have handled it, has been to contribute whatever was useful from my knowledge of the farms and the people of the county wherever it would help the Agricultural Conservation Program. Of course, in a county of 1800 farms, according to the 1954 census, 1200 to 1400 actual farms, and an annual participation in the ACP of 1100 to 1300, over the years, it has not always been that any of us were well acquainted with every farm under discussion, but among us we did pretty well cover it. I might say that in Franklin County we have what I consider very good distribution of farms all over the county. No town has less than 60 farms and the highest has around 200. This makes it possible, and I think desirable, to have each town operate as a community in the Agricultural Conservation Program, and seems to make the whole operation of organization and sign-up work out very smoothly. There again of course, the smoothness of the program is the result of good working relationships all along the line. So with this distribution of farms and each town as a community, we have had only 14 communities in the county and each year since the program was completely organized, we have chosen community committeemen at an annual election in each town.

My part in these election meetings has also changed considerably over the years. At first I did much of the arranging of dates and places as well as contributing a talk on some subject of particular interest at the time. These included such things as crop production and handling, dairy diseases, marketing, dairy management, sometimes motion pictures, if one of particular usefulness could be found and very often these talks were illustrated with slides. The same talk was usually given at each of the meetings of

that year. Sometimes with these meetings, it was as much a question of getting help from the county committee in getting out an audience for me as it was in my helping to get out a good attendance for the program explanation and the election of the community committeemen. The attendance at these meetings pretty well reflects the interest of the farmers and over the years we have had from 3 to 75 in attendance. Mostly they run from 15 to 40. The low numbers of less than 10 have occurred very seldom and those few times we have arranged a second meeting because the county committee and I did not consider the number present sufficient for the elections. Until recent years we - meaning the county committee and I - have scheduled these meetings so that I could attend each of them. More recently with an assistant county agent and a county forester, we have divided up the meetings. This makes it possible to complete the series in a much shorter period of time. At the same time I have missed meeting so many of the farmers who attend. Of course, the actual conduct of the meeting was in the hands of the county committeeman who always attended, and the community committeemen, or more recently the community election board.

In recent years we have had the added problem of the county election board which has met to select an election board for each community. As chairman of this county board, I have gotten the other members together, canvassed the eligible people in each community and set up the committee of members who we know could do a good job of holding the election. I notified these community election board members in each town and passed their names on to the county committee who arranged with them the dates, places and program of the election meeting.

Personally, I regard this as just about the most useless thing I do during the year, but as at some other times, I go along with it because somewhere and by somebody it is considered to be of real importance. There should certainly be a better way of handling that part of my job, even allowing for the training these people get in handling a meeting and the excellent job most of them have done at it.

Now I want to speak about another angle of my job and that is the help I get through the community committeemen. And I will lead up to it by recounting a little of the evolution and development of county agent work over the years.

Looking back nearly 40 years and knowing the situation even before that when life - particularly farming seemed much simpler - at least it operated under less pressure - the County Agent was looked to and did supply, as the Smith Lever Act says - "Helpful and Useful Information." There were few if any others in that field locally. There was always more need for information than the County Agent could supply. When the ACP program came along, I saw the possibility and welcomed the help of the community committeemen in taking some of this information personally and directly to more farmers than I could ever do alone. And I want to express my appreciation of the job they did and are still doing. I have sometimes felt about them and referred to them as assistant county agents. They have been a very great help to me personally and, of course, to the people of the county in the information and recommendations they have passed on about good farming practices. Aside from the value of the ACP practices themselves, these community committeemen have, to a very real extent, contributed to the progress made on our farms. These men have been and I hope will continue to be a real force for good farming.

Another very real part of my job I have felt to be, is keeping these committeemen informed as far as I can. I feel that the good work being done by SCS, Forest Service, Dairy Fieldmen, feed and fertilizer representatives, is still no more important to the whole county agriculture than these community committeemen.

Now I hope that in the course of my remarks, I have not implied that the County Agent's job with the county committee has been what made the program so successful. The program has been successful because it met a need and because it made a great contribution to present progress and to the future welfare of agriculture. The crop and soil-building programs have done some fine things in the way of introducing needed and essential steps ahead, as for example, the liming practice which had made but discouraging progress from the time a lime-producing plant was established in 1925 at Fonda Junction by Frank Wilder, until the ACP came into the picture in 1936. The progress wasn't too bad, measured in terms of the 1920's, but not good as measured by the needs of today. The same could be said for the superphosphate promotion. This county had made an enviable record in sales of super ever since the early 20's, when many straight cars of super were brought in. But again it was only a drop in the bucket to the use in recent years. We pioneered in pasture improvement, but again with not too startling results until we had the help of the ACP program and county and community committeemen in their own job and as assistant county agents.

I find in my reports a statement that 200 to 350 tons of super were used alone as super per year in the mid 20's - of course, then it was called acid phosphate - and that over 400 tons of lime were used in 1926 from the local lime-grinding plant. We thought this was pretty good then. Now compare that to the soil-building done by the thousands of tons of super and lime used each year for many years under ACP. The summary of the State ASC Office shows: About 80,000 tons of super used from 1936 to 1958 inclusive, or an average of over 3400 tons per year. That's just as superphosphate. Then since 1936, there have been about 190,000 tons of lime used, or again an average of over 8000 tons per year. This certainly is not nearly as much as the county needs, but it is a commendable record just the same. 1958, for instance, the last year for which we have statistics, was a better than average year with over 3800 tons of super and over 11,000 tons of lime. The value of heavier use of lime and super for soil-building has been well established.

Woodland improvement shows the same comparison but even yet the efforts of all of us have not been able to get this very important project really off the ground. I feel rather badly that aside from the tree-planting project of the last 3 or 4 years, little forestry progress has been made. Let's hope it won't be much longer before the county begins to make better use of this very important resource which takes up at least one-third of the land area of the county.

Some other items of the program have shown less than ideal use, but real progress has been made and will be made in the future. As Ex-Officio member I have sometimes spoken about some other practices or farm improvements that I think might well be the concern of ACP.

This talk is, of course, just one County Agent's review of his job as Ex-Officio member of the county committee. Other agents in this country where we still have considerable choice of what we do and how we do it, will see and do the job differently and very likely much better. Probably because I have been associated with it from the start, I have viewed my job to be the promoting, wherever possible, of the Agricultural Conservation Program as a help in the past and in the present, to the farmers of my county and because it is doing such a good job in building and conserving our soil and along with our soil, our human resources for the future.

I wish you all success in the years to come.

CHALLENGES FOR ACP IN 1961

Address by Paul M. Koger, Administrator
Agricultural Conservation Program Service, USDA
at State ASC Conference
Burlington, Vermont, March 24-25, 1960

It's a great pleasure to visit with you again, and to participate in your meeting. This gives me an opportunity to meet with you committeemen, county office managers, and with people who have been instrumental in administering the ACP here in Vermont.

However, I'd like to add that it's not often I'm extended the white carpet welcome as I was on this occasion. I recall my first visit to your great State four years ago, shortly after I had been named Administrator of the ACP, and at that time I believe I also received a white carpet welcome.

During the years that many of you have been an ASC committeeman, we've experienced many changes in the agricultural field. We've noted the increase in farm size, the shifting of farm land to industrial and urban uses, more mechanization on the farms, more specialized farms, and many other technological and scientific developments. These changes, coupled with the technological and scientific advances, have brought many problems and challenges which we, who work with agriculture, must constantly plan and seek new and better methods with which we can meet these responsibilities.

Today, I would like to share with you some thoughts as I see them about the challenges for the ACP in 1961. In doing this, I would like to discuss:

1. The changes and trends in agriculture that affect conservation.

2. The historical role of the ACP in meeting conservation needs.

3. And the proposed changes in the National program.

With our steadily increasing population and growing economy, we who are engaged in conservation work must fully realize at all times the importance of conserving the soil, water, timber, and mineral resources for future use.

As we look ahead, we can visualize how great these challenges will be, and we can take constructive measures to conserve our resources which are so vital to the Nation's economy. I'm confident that you people here in Vermont will continue to meet these challenges and work diligently toward conserving these resources. Also, I'm sure you committeemen will continue to help set the pace for the committees throughout the rest of the Nation.

Looking at the 1958 report, your record illustrates that you are setting the pace in many ways. The report tells us that out of a total of 11,891 farms, 7,611 or 64 percent of these farms, containing 83 percent of all the cropland in the State participated in the ACP. This 64 percent participation of farms surpasses all other States in the United States. I'm sure you are proud of this achievement.

Another phase of your program which is outstanding, is the county informational meetings used to train committeemen. This indicates that an effective working relationship exists between the State and county committees as well as other groups who work closely with the ACP.

I understand that you make it a practice to invite farmers to these meetings, and also many counties have farmer-businessman dinners. To me, this illustrates a high caliber of leadership and I commend you for it. This is the type of leadership we can depend on to help meet the conservation challenges in each particular county and State.

Since conditions vary between States, and even between counties, it's very difficult to formulate a National ACP that will equally benefit the conservation needs of each State.

In the Northeast, replacement of minerals, lost by constant use or leaching, is needed to derive and sustain the conservation benefits of a grass economy. Farmers in the Northeast Area are helping to meet conservation needs by using the ACP cost-sharing program.

Your ACP report of 1958 shows that Vermont farmers completed a substantial number of the "most needed" conservation practices on their farms in 1958. I note that you assisted farmers to:

1. Establish 73,548 acres of permanent cover for soil protection.

2. Improve 26,314 acres of vegetative cover.

3. Improve water conservation practices.

4. Plant and conserve forest trees.

Approximately 90 percent of your cost-share funds was expended for vegetative cover practices. The other 10 percent was used for forestry, mechanical, and water conservation practices.

To illustrate how the conservation needs vary, we can look at the needs of other areas of the Nation. In the Southeast, consideration must be given to the problems of disposing of excess rainfall without causing erosion. As a result of this, more emphasis is placed on establishing and maintaining adequate cover on the land to protect and conserve the soil.

Out in the Great Plains, farmers and ranchers have the problem of retaining all the moisture that falls. This means developing more vegetative cover to protect the soil and to prevent wind erosion.

In the Far West, conservation needs include measures necessary to secure the greatest efficiency from limited supplies of available irrigation water.

Thus, we can readily see why it is very difficult to formulate a National ACP that meets the needs of all areas. Therefore, local programs are developed to give priority to conservation practices designed specifically to meet State and County needs.

In formulating our programs, we must always keep in mind that sound conservation programs for the whole country must be carefully planned and directed toward meeting the major conservation problems. Equally important -- in my judgment -- the ACP must keep up with the changing times in agriculture. Only in this way can the ACP most effectively help meet the conservation problems and conditions of the days and years ahead.

Turning now, let's direct our attention to some of the changes and trends which affect us in agriculture and in the field of conservation.

Today, as we look back at some of these changes, we immediately think about the time when the farmer depended largely upon horse power, his own labor, and production goods which came from his own farm. This was when the farming unit consisted of many enterprises which were necessary to provide a living for his family. In other words, the farmer was a self-sufficient production unit.

Since then, many scientific and technological advances have occurred which have caused a tremendous change in the farm structure. These changes not only have caused adjustments in the farm structure, but also have required more services from non-farm agencies and groups.

As a result of this inter-relationship, agricultural and industrial sectors have become increasingly interdependent. Thus, we have seen an evolution in farming from an agricultural to an agri-business status which is likely to continue.

We have an excellent example of agri-business here in your State. In a recent survey, about fifty percent of all the Vermont workers were employed in this line of work. One-half of these workers were engaged directly in farming and in forestry, while the other half were employed in processing and distributing these farm products, or supplying farmers with their production needs.

Another marked change which has occurred in the last two decades, is the unprecedented increase in farm-size. In 1940, the average size farm was 174 acres. Last year, the average size had increased to 270 acres. This compares with 245 acres, the estimated average size farm here in Vermont.

Each year, machines that further reduce labor requirements are developed. This means farmers will be able to handle more acres of crops and more livestock units, which will, in turn, necessitate more land per farm.

Along with this change is, of course, a decline in the number of farms. The number of farms declined from 5 million 800 thousand in 1950 to 4 million 750 thousand in 1954, a decrease of about one million. There is estimated to be a further decrease to about 4 1/4 million in 1959. This trend, however, is not new for it's been going on almost steadily since the mid 30's.

Following this trend, is the decrease in the farm population. In the late 1940's, we had about 25 million people living on farms. Today, it is down to about 20 million, a decline of 5 million in about a decade.

What do these changes and trends mean? (1) They simply mean that the producing land and producing capacity is as great as ever; (2) that mechanization has enabled farmers to care for more acres, which has released farm labor to other industries; (3) that the farm population has and is now shifting into other areas of off-farm work; and (4) that worn-out land has been replaced in one area with new, frequently irrigated, land in another and the consolidation of farms in almost all areas into larger, more productive units. Thus, today we have fewer farms, with a smaller farm population, but the farms are now larger and more efficient.

Briefly now, let's consider what has happened to production on our farms. Crop yield per acre and total production, as well as output per farm livestock unit, have increased considerably. This increased production has resulted from the tremendous advances in farm technology.

Mechanization has speeded up farm operations, made better tillage possible, and has increased output per worker, as well as yield per acre. Farmers have stepped up the use of fertilizer to increase yields.

There have been great advances in the control of pests, weeds, and plant diseases. New and improved varieties and strains of seeds have been developed. Outstanding progress has been made in feeding and caring for livestock.

The Department of Agriculture and Land Grant colleges along with other agencies, through their research and educational efforts, have provided assistance and valuable services to farmers. These and many other methods have helped to increase yields and expand total farm production.

The increase in farm production and increase in farm size is associated with a similar large increase in the volume of capital used in production. This means that farmers have invested large amounts of capital in the form of land, buildings, machinery, and other production equipment.

This trend toward larger farms and larger capital requirements has been accompanied by a growth in specialization. As many farmers eliminated small home enterprises, they found it was profitable to specialize in production of a few enterprises to better utilize the large capital investments. Specialization in dairy and poultry farming, for example, is increasing significantly.

In the last few years, we have noted a trend toward vertical integration in certain agricultural products. We have noticed this more in broilers, some fruits and vegetables, and to a certain extent in livestock production.

In addition to changes in our agricultural economy, we also have a fast-growing population. In 1975, the Bureau of the Census estimates the population will total 230 million, an increase of 50 million over our current population of 180 million. Looking ahead 50 years from now, the Census Bureau says we may have 370 million people.

This means, in years ahead, the demand for food production will be greater than ever. So we, who work in conservation, must realize the great responsibility we have of making sure our conservation programs are designed to handle the conservation problems which may develop as a result of the changes in agriculture and changes in land-use which will be needed to supply our growing population with food, fiber and other needs to maintain a strong and healthy economy.

As we look ahead, we can expect the changes and trends toward more specialization, vertical integration, larger farms, high capital farming, expanded production to be with us in years to come. To meet this tremendous challenge, we as a group must cooperate and work closely with other conservation agencies to assist farmers in adjusting and adapting farming programs which will utilize their resources more fully.

With the changing conditions and the prospective future changes in agriculture, it is imperative that we continue to re-examine and often re-orient ourselves as to our role in conservation. In doing this, we not only need to familiarize ourselves with the ACP, but at the same time see if our program is meeting the conservation needs in these fast-moving times.

Four weeks ago, February 29, marked the 24th year the ACP has been in operation.

In 1936, legislation was passed establishing the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act. This marked the birth of the farmer-committee system and the Agricultural Conservation Program.

Through these 24 years ACP has been in operation, the farmer-committee system has, in my judgment, been largely responsible for its success. The members of the committees understand the conservation problems and they possess the "know how" to use the "tools" of the ACP effectively in solving these conservation problems. I'm sure we all recognize that the members who serve on these committees have done a great service for both our communities and our counties.

The adaptability, as well as the flexibility, of the ACP to adjust to changing and varying conservation needs, has, undoubtedly, contributed to its success. Looking at our program from 1936 up through 1942, the ACP assisted farmers to shift large acreages from soil depleting to soil building crops.

In the years of 1942 through 1952 -- the period which included most of World War II and the Korean War -- the program assisted farmers in carrying out conservation practices which helped produce more agricultural products needed during wartime.

Then in 1954, the ACP started the movement toward more permanent-type conservation practices with enduring benefits. Four years later, 1958, 86 percent of all the cost-share funds, on a National basis, was used for permanent-type practices. In Vermont, you used practically all, 99 percent, of your funds for these practices.

The ACP, however, has operated with but few modifications in the program practices and principles since 1954. The major change was in 1957 when we got away from the initial establishment policy which limited cost-sharing assistance on the permanent vegetative cover practice to only once in solving the problem. We now recognize that cost-sharing assistance is needed for measures that would materially extend the life of permanent vegetative cover or for re-establishing vegetative cover after it has served its lifespan. This occurred shortly after we returned from a New England tour that was arranged by Mr. Soule. To me, this change was badly needed and was an improvement in the program. This change made it possible for ACP to be more effective in bringing about and maintaining desirable land-use adjustment.

If we look at some of our statistics, we can see that the ACP has been very effective. In the last five years, approximately 22 million acres of vegetative cover have been established on farms throughout the country. Most of this conservation cover was established on cropland producing at an intensive level. In addition to this, farmers were assisted in improving another nine million acres to extend its lifespan. If farmers had not been assisted in improving vegetative cover on this land, it might have been shifted to the production of crops.

Thus, today the ACP has made progress in dealing with conservation problems that challenge us all. However, it is important that we keep our programs designed to meet the future problems and not lose sight of our fundamental responsibility.

In the 24 years the ACP has been in operation, many people have said the National program should now be developed to the extent where it should not require any major changes. This has both logic and merit. Every year a number of States recommend that the National program be left alone so farmers will be in a better position to understand it. Others say we must continue to review the program because of the dramatic changes in our agricultural economy.

At the present, I believe we have about reached the point where few, if any, basic changes are needed in the National program. I believe we now have a National ACP that is specific and clear in its objective -- one that can be adjusted easily without making many major national changes -- and one that is flexible enough for State and county committees to make any local adjustments that may be needed.

While I believe that we now have an excellent program -- probably the best we've ever had -- I believe also that a few minor changes are needed to strengthen the program and to maintain both farmer and non-farmer support for it.

I believe we will serve the best interest of farmers when we take the necessary actions to keep the program in a setting where it can be fully supported and justified on the basis of its conservation accomplishments.

(PROPOSED AUTHORIZATION AND CHANGES FOR THE 1961 ACP)

In view of what I've said and the fact that you will soon be concerned about setting up your county ACP for 1961, I want to discuss briefly the authorization and the changes proposed for the National program in 1961.

The budget proposes an advance authorization of $100 million for the 1961 ACP. At that level, costs would be shared on conservation measures that are needed and in which there is a visible public interest, but which farmers are not likely to finance from their own funds.

Generally, the basic ACP authorities which have been in effect for several years would continue. I believe that Federal cost-sharing under the 1961 program should be directed toward conservation measures in each county that will contribute to less intensive use of cropland. I also believe that assistance should be curtailed or eliminated for those measures which will contribute to an early increase in production.

We would expect to continue the broad authorities that permit ACP Development Groups to formulate effective State and county programs which research and local practical experience indicate are needed. However, I believe some changes in the National program will result in more effective use of program funds. I believe that these changes should be made regardless of the size of the 1961 program authorized by the Congress. Some of these will affect your program in Vermont.

First, in my opinion, we should now discontinue the offer of cost-sharing for land clearing, removal of stone walls and hedgerows, and installation of fences, as components of approved practices.

Cost-sharing for these measures has been available only where needed in conjunction with other measures to meet a conservation problem. However, the cost of these measures is often high in comparison with the conservation benefits resulting from their application.

I believe the funds that would be used for these measures, can be more effectively used for other measures that provide greater conservation benefits. I also believe that elimination of cost-sharing for such measures will not materially reduce the performance of the conservation practices to which they have been related.

The second proposed change has to do with irrigation and drainage practices. At present, cost-sharing for most drainage and irrigation practices is limited to land that has been used for agricultural production or has been under irrigation for at least two of the last five years. We propose to increase this to four out of the last five years.

This change would increase the minimum period that land must have been devoted to the production of cultivated crops or crops normally seeded for hay or pasture. And it would increase the period an irrigation system must have been in use to make the land or system eligible for cost-sharing for these practices.

This change would help to eliminate criticism, and would emphasize the ACP policy of not bringing more land into agricultural production. This change would also prevent the possibility of a farmer installing a poor irrigation system at his own expense with the expectation of getting cost-share help to reorganize it soon after installation.

Third, we propose to offer cost-sharing for rock phosphate under the same conditions which apply to other phosphate fertilizers.

The principal effect of this change would be that rock phosphate applied on normal seedings of vegetative cover in crop rotation would no longer be eligible for ACP cost-sharing. This would place rock phosphate on the same basis as other fertilizers under the program.

Fourth, we propose to require more careful consideration of the amount of fertilizer needed to establish green manure and cover crops, and to approve cost-sharing only for the minimum quantity of fertilizer needed to establish the eligible cover. If we cost-share for more fertilizer than is needed, substantial benefit from the additional amount may carry over to the depleting crops which normally follow.

The fifth proposed change would require -- as a condition of eligibility for cost-sharing the application of liming materials, gypsum, and other sulphur-bearing materials -- that eligible grasses and legumes occupy the land for at least two growing seasons. This would withhold cost-sharing from land to be returned more immediately to other crop use, and assure the conserving crops would receive the major benefit of the conservation materials.

The sixth proposed change would approve cost-sharing for wells for livestock water and cost-sharing for deferred grazing of rangeland, only after receiving individual county or area recommendations and justifications.

In addition to our proposed program changes, we hope the Congress will eliminate the small cost-share increase provision contained in Section 8 (e) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act. Legislation (in H.R. 6094) is now before the Congress to accomplish this and the Department has reported favorably on its enactment.

State and county farmer committees say that little if any additional conservation is obtained by the payment of these increases.

Actually, these proposed changes have already been incorporated in many of the State and county programs. However, experience indicates that these and other changes won't be fully accomplished unless they are made in the national program.

As you can see, few of these changes would affect your program in Vermont. However, if they are made, they will, in my opinion, strengthen the national program and thereby better assure that you will continue to have the opportunity to carry out the fine program which you are administering here in Vermont.

In closing, we must keep in mind that the Department of Agriculture has various tools with which to advance the conservation task. All of them are effectively designed to help attain the objective of keeping our Nation's storehouse of soil, water and related resources intact and capable of providing for the future needs of a healthy democracy.

For you and me, there is a continuing job to do. In the foreseeable future, at least, we as agricultural workers, in my opinion, are faced with greater responsibilities and opportunities of unselfish service than ever before in our history. I am confident we can and will live up to our obligation.

CURRENT PROBLEMS IN AGRICULTURE

Address by Marvin L. McLain
Assistant Secretary of Agriculture
at State ASC Conference
Burlington, Vermont, March 24-25, 1960

I sincerely welcome the invitation to attend and speak at your State Conference. It's my pleasure to become better acquainted with you and to listen to your problems. It is also my wish that I can better help you understand -- a little about the current condition of agriculture nationally - then some of the real problems facing all of us in agriculture -- also a little about the way we should move with our programs for agriculture.

Believe me when I say that you people are the key people who help carry out our Federal action programs for farmers. You are the link between the U.S.D.A. and the farmers. If you do a good job -- programs are understood and are of benefit. If you don't do your job -- Federal programs are of little value.

Now a little about the current condition of agriculture nationally.

Our nation's farm productivity is surging forward with great vigor in an irreversible and continuous technological revolution. This was never more evident than during 1958. Due in part to favorable weather, crop production climbed to a new peak -- 11 percent higher than the previous record. This huge production was achieved with the smallest planted acreage in 40 years. With good weather this production continued in 1959 and about equaled the 1958 output in total.

Although serious problems still confront us, the year 1959 was also one of substantial financial improvements for the big majority of the nation's farm families in many ways.

The standard of living on farms is the highest on record.

Total agricultural assets are at an all-time high.

Total debt owed by farmers is only about 11½% of agricultural assets.

Per capita income, from all sources, of persons living on farms is at or near record high.

Farm ownership is at a record high.

Farm land values are at record high.

Farm foreclosures are extremely low.

Farms are better equipped and are more mechanized than ever before.

A record high proportion of farms have electricity and telephones.

Farm exports the last three fiscal years were $4.7 billion, $4 billion, and $3.7 billion -- an all time high. They will be about $4.2 billion for current fiscal year ending July 1, 1960. More important, exports continue to look good for the future.

Prospects are real good for a high level of economic activity in 1960. This should mean high employment and good domestic demand for products from the farm all through the year.

Now a little about some of the real problems facing all of us in agriculture.

The inflated prices that farmers have to pay for the things they buy as compared with the things they sell is one of our real problems.

Production expense for our farmers last year amounted to over 26 billion dollars. In 1940 this farm production expense was about 7 billion dollars -- in 1952 it was 22.6 billion dollars. This is an increase of about 370 percent in 20 years.

The increase in production costs in the last 10 years has been brought on by such items as: 40 to 45 percent increase for tractors; more than 50 percent increase for plows; combines up 50 percent; milk cans up 60 percent; barbed wire up 40 percent. Horse collars are up less than 30 percent -- but, of course, no one buys them any more. The only place they have been used recently is on the front end of Edsel cars -- and they quit making them last year.

Farmers are becoming much more efficient in their operations. They benefit, and they expect their customers to share in these benefits. For instance -- in 1914, an average laborer could buy a pound loaf of bread with the returns of 16 minutes' work. Today he can buy a better pound loaf for only 5 minutes' work. Farmers all over our nation are demonstrating each year further improvement in efficiency of production.

The farmers' share of food dollar was 52 percent in 1944, 43 percent in 1954, 40 percent in 1958 and averaged about 38 percent in 1959. This drop is taking place in spite of farmers' increased efficiency.

Farmers have the right to expect the same efficiency from business and labor. Farmers also have the right to expect this efficiency to be passed along so that the cost of things they must buy, for production purposes, does not continue to go up and up.

The inflationary tendency in our economy is one of the most serious domestic problems facing the American farmer and the American people today. We all remember that our good hard-earned dollar shrank in value from $1.00 to 52 cents in the twelve years preceding 1953. It has been depreciated only 4 cents more, down to 48 cents, in the last seven years. The problems and long-term implications resulting from the threat of inflation should be of utmost concern to every one of us.

Here is what the immediate postwar inflation did to farmers in this country from 1946 to 1952. Gross farm income increased from $30 billion in 1946 to $37 billion in 1952 -- a rise of $7 billion. But realized net farm income was actually $800 million less in 1952 than it was in 1946. The inflated price of things farmers had to buy, to produce their products,

more than wiped out the $7 billion gain in gross income. And even worse -- these inflated costs got permanently frozen into the farmers' operating picture and they have continued to suffer ever since.

Inflation has long-time as well as immediate implications to our farm people.

In 1959 about 9 percent of the farm population was 65 years and over, compared with 5 percent in 1930. Are these people in their declining years, after most of their productive years have ended, going to be forced to watch the erosion of their life savings? Half the farm population consists of people under 24 years of age. Are inflated prices going to make it more and more difficult for young people to acquire their own farms? Are soft wage settlements and undue price rises going to price agriculture out of more markets and industrial production out of farm markets? Must we allow the real value of savings bonds, life insurance, and other savings to erode away? Isn't it time we stood up and were counted on this issue? Those who say "a little inflation is inevitable, relax and enjoy it" are doing a tremendous disservice not only to our farm people but to the whole nation.

Control of inflation involves the cooperation not only of Federal, State and local governments and their programs of expenditures -- but also of business and labor in their negotiation of labor contracts, in setting wage rates and also in pricing the many products that consumers must buy. Government can exercise restraint through its control of expenditures and credit. The President's balanced budget for fiscal year 1961 (his fourth) should be a powerful factor in the fight against inflation. Business and labor must do a far better job in this area of holding the line against rising prices. The general public as well as farmers are going to demand that this be done.

Because of some of our price support and other programs, our surplus -- mostly in our price-supported commodities, continues to pile up. It is now in excess of 9 billion dollars' worth again -- this in spite of heavy exports under P. L. 480 and our Soil Bank Program.

Because of the heavy costs of these programs and more important because they have not been getting the job done, we have for the last 7 years asked for major changes in our farm programs -- but with only minor success with the Congress.

Now a little about the way we should move with our programs for agriculture.

In 1958 the Congress did pass legislation that moved in the right direction for cotton, rice and corn. This new legislation should be given a fair trial and we have suggested this to the Congress. While the legislation does not go as far as the administration has suggested, it is at least in the right direction.

A tobacco bill which only partially recognizes the bad situation tobacco farmers find themselves in was finally passed by the current session of Congress. We approved the legislation, even though it will not really solve the tobacco farmers' problem, because it was a mild step in the right direction.

We badly need new legislation for the other two basic commodities -- wheat and peanuts -- especially for wheat.

We have recommended that the wheat law be changed to lower the minimum price support level and relate supports to a percentage of the average market price for the last three years. We have also recommended that wheat allotments be done away with beginning in 1961. They have been completely ineffective and have caused the wheat acreage to shift from the old traditional wheat area to the 15-acre wheat farmer all over the country. In 1959 there were 690,000 wheat farmers growing less than 15 acres. This is more wheat farmers than grow over 15 acres. Only those farmers with 15-acre allotments and over are eligible to vote in a marketing quota referendum.

Support prices were never intended to be a ceiling over prices but rather a floor under prices to permit orderly marketing.

We are also asking Congress to extend the Conservation Reserve Program authorization beyond 1960. We have asked for an expansion up to 60 million acres. We feel this program will also help greatly in the transition period and should be extended so that farmers who want to voluntarily retire their land from production on a competitive basis, can do so. It makes good sense to store our surplus in the ground rather than in bins or elevators. It is also cheaper and has better public acceptance.

In addition to these changes in support levels, we asked and Congress extended P. L. 480 for 2 more years past January 1, 1960. This will permit us to move vast quantities of food and fiber for foreign currencies and will help in the transition in getting support prices adjusted. It should help get some new markets too.

We have asked for and received a part of added funds from Congress for an expanded utilization research program -- to find new and more uses for added farm products. This is an important area that demands more funds and action.

We have been behind the starting of the Rural Development Program to help in the adjustments that must be made with farm people. State and local people have been very helpful in guiding this program and it is now ready to be expanded and pushed as rapidly as possible. Pilot counties have started programs in some 200 counties in 30 States and the program is catching on in good shape. Getting jobs where people are and people where jobs are and helping people fit into this pattern is not easy. More and better opportunities for farm people can come through the Rural Development Program. This will also help in the transition in agricultural programs.

We have also asked to have the Sugar Act extended.

Now, just a word about blind alleys. Most people know that some changes must be made in our programs, but some want to take us down more dangerous paths.

One such alley is the Production Payment or "Brannan Type" program. In our judgment the cost would be prohibitive -- could be in excess of 10 billion dollars annually. This type program could lead to bankruptcy of all farm programs and a socialized agriculture, because a large share of farmers' net income would come from the Federal treasury.

Also the certificate or two-price plan such as has been suggested for wheat, rice and cotton. This type "bread tax" approach will not be accepted by consumers -- it would permit synthetic products to take over the market -- it is unfair to producers of other commodities -- and unfair to our foreign neighbors, if all our excess were dumped in world market at whatever price they would bring.

In conclusion let me say that those of us who work with the Federal action programs for farmers have a real opportunity and challenge.

We must understand the programs we have and do our very best to help farmers understand them and benefit from them.

If we have suggestions for improving these programs, we should pass this information on to our superiors.

We should always be courteous and honest in carrying out our duties.

I know that each of you -- whatever your task -- is having one of the greatest experiences of your life in doing your job well.

Finally in concluding I would like to urge each one of you to be fully cooperative at all times with others in the Department, who work with other agencies and programs. Many of these other programs are just as important to farm people in other areas as ours. Therefore we should always be cooperative and helpful and of course, expect the same from others.

If we take the proper attitude toward others and their programs, we will all get along better. More important, all of our work will be easier, more pleasant, and above all, of the maximum benefit to farmers.

My thoughts on this point can well be summarized by the following poem "Proper Attitude:"

It's the friendly way you greet a man
  Tho' you're feeling mighty tough
It's the way you smile a "Howdy"
  When the day ahead looks rough.

It's the way you say "Good Morning"
  And call fellow workers by name
It's mighty hard to do at times
  But -- you do it just the same.

It's admitting little errors
  And accepting criticism due
It's doing unto others
  As you would have them do to you.

It's diagnosing troubles
  To bring them to an end
And the warmth in saying "Thank You"
  "Won't you please come back again."

HOLDING BETTER COUNTY COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Purpose of This Panel Discussion

Introduction by Charles B. Doane, Fieldman
Vermont State ASC Office
at State ASC Conference, Burlington, Vermont, March 25, 1960

"Holding good county committee meetings" is the basis and foundation of good administration. County committees are responsible for the administration and operation of the agricultural programs at the county level.

If our committee meetings are haphazard affairs without thorough preparation and are conducted in an unbusinesslike manner, our operation is very apt to be that same way.

The committee meeting is the medium by which the committeemen learn of the day-to-day operation of the office from the office manager's reports; are advised of the policies that are to be made and of the problems requiring their action.

The manager needs their decisions - carefully and thoroughly considered.

This morning, after a fine meal and stimulating talks and relaxing recreation last evening, should be an excellent time to take another look at our committee meetings.

As we do this, ask yourselves, in a critical way - are my county meetings all that they can or should be? Can I give them a new look?

To help us take this look are our four panelists - three county office managers and a county committeeman. Most of you know them:

Edla Browne - Addison County
Louise Rand - Orange County
Bethany French - Rutland County
Stuart Newton - Franklin County

They have supplied you with some sample material in the folders you have been given. This may help you follow their discussion and stimulate some questions on your part.

HOLDING BETTER COUNTY COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Preparation and Use of Agenda
Talk by Mrs. Edla Browne, Addison County Office Manager
at State ASC Conference,
Burlington, Vermont, March 25, 1960

The overall ASC county office workload is based on the policy made by each ASC county committee at county committee meetings. Without these meetings, the office manager would have but few guides to follow as to how that county committee would like their various programs carried out. The county committee agrees on policy at county committee meetings; therefore, these meetings are of much importance.

The frequency of holding meetings has often been discussed, and again is left to the individual counties. Some think they should be called when needed. There is hardly a day in an ASC office when a manager does not have a problem; the question is, "How soon do I need the answer to our problem?" When is the "need" for a meeting the greatest? We could hold meetings for individual problems several times a month, but is this necessary? In our own county, the committee has "reserved" the second Tuesday of every month for regular county committee meetings. This has worked out very well. We plan our work around this "second Tuesday," and start meetings in the morning. Our agenda determines a half-day or all-day meeting; but starting in the morning always takes care of our needs. Once-a-month meetings keep the county committee up to date on the progress of the various programs. We have never discussed evening meetings - there is a question - can you give good thought in making decisions after a day's work? I would think that this should be each county's decision.

Determining items for an agenda should not create a problem. The following are always regular items: Minutes of the previous meeting; unfinished business, if any, from the previous meeting; regular ASC letters received after the previous meeting; each month's account, administrative budget, program funds, status of all programs, correspondence, plus other important business; and then the next meeting date. Our office keeps a folder for meeting material. ASC letters, correspondence, etc., are placed in this folder until action is taken by the county committee and recorded in the minutes of a county committee meeting. They are then filed, and new material begins to build up for our next meeting.

All concerned should be reminded of the county committee meeting; therefore, approximately one week in advance of our regular meeting a memo is issued to the county committee, county agent, SCS technician, county forester, and State fieldman, giving them the subjects to be discussed; however, after this memo is sent and if new items are added, they should be reviewed with the Chairman previous to the meeting. (Reviewing the agenda with the Chairman is always a good idea regardless of new items.)

If the county agent's, SCS technician's or forester's time is limited, it is arranged to discuss the items concerning them the most at their convenience. By doing this, we feel we get good cooperation from them, and pretty good attendance at meetings.

In summary, to carry out the policy of the county committee as voted by them for the various programs, we should have the action recorded, but not here and there. There should be a place that we can look for their decision. This place can be in the "minutes" of your county committee meeting. Put a little "time" into getting the items together that require discussion, and list these items on an agenda - the result saves time at your meeting - the meeting runs smoother -- thought has already gone into items for discussion, and items are not forgotten that require discussion and action of your committee.

HOLDING BETTER COUNTY COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Preparing Reference Materials for Meetings
Talk by Louise Rand, Orange County Office Manager
at State ASC Conference
Burlington, Vermont, March 25, 1960

We try in Orange County to have available informational material to present to the county committee so that they will be able to make decisions and to be kept up to date on the activities. I will try to explain how it is handled in our county.

The previous month's expense accounts are reviewed at each meeting. A copy of the summary form lists the various ones who have been paid that month and the amounts for each. They review the Form CSS-497 which is the Monthly Summary of Expenses. It shows the allocation for each program, the current month's expenses, the total expenses to date, and the balance left for use the rest of the year.

An auditor once mentioned that we should have a day-to-day summary on programs. I thought it was a good idea so gave his idea a try on applications for payment. This information is entered on a 5 x 8 post card, - it indicates the amount of the allocation, less 5% ASC-SCS funds, soil sampling, CMS materials paid, less any purchase orders processed and the applications processed. By using this card, I can tell the committee the number of applications processed and the balance in the allocation available for other applications. We have a listing of all who have been approved for cash practices and we cross off all those who have been paid and any that are cancelled. In that way we know the ones yet to be paid and their cost-share. I also find it helpful to keep a record as each lot of applications are processed. It is a quick source of information that may be needed for the control of program funds and also information for the statistical summary.

In reporting to the committee on the progress of 1960 ACP sign-up we refer to the blackboard on which I have written the latest information concerning materials paid to date, the amount ordered out and delivered. The entries are changed as the additions are made each day.

The amount that is requested by farmers is kept up to date each day during sign-up as we deposit each day's collections and complete the ACP-203-3's, County Office Record Sheet. A record is kept each day of the collections received; the materials paid for, such as lime, super and 0-20-20; the unpaid CMS materials, and the cash practices requested by the farmers. By doing this we can keep the committee informed each week of the number of farmers signed up, the materials requested and the balance left in the allocation for other requests.

I summarized the Conservation Reserve Program to the committee on February 15. This gave them a chance to compare the sign-up during the years. I also mentioned that 1959 annual CRP payments (1957 through 1959 contracts) had been made to the farmers in the amount of $28,325.09. There was one violator and there was withheld from his payment $9.30.

To date 17 sheep owners have applied for incentive payment on wool sold. Letters have been sent to all sheep owners reminding them of the deadline date of March 31, 1960 to sell wool or lambs. In 1958, 30 farmers applied. A letter was sent to all committeemen too, along with a list of the sheep owners, and they were asked to check the list and advise us of any deletions or additions.

In summary, I think that an office manager should prepare complete and up-to-date reports for a committee meeting, since they have important decisions to make and need all the information they can get to make the right decision. Our way of doing it is a lot of work (not if kept up to date) but we know they appreciate it.

HOLDING BETTER COUNTY COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Keeping County Committee Meetings on the Subject

Brief of Talk by Stuart A. Newton, Chairman,
Franklin County ASC Committee
at State ASC Conference, Burlington, Vermont, March 25, 1960

(Since Mr. Newton spoke extemporaneously,
no copy of his talk is available.)

Franklin County is an intensive dairy county and makes full use of ASC programs. The Franklin County Committee is very much interested in making the program work and in treating farmers fairly and equitably.

To have good county committee meetings we must:

1. Hold meetings where there is a minimum of interruption.

2. Have an agenda - order of the agenda is not always followed exactly but all items are covered.

3. Hold day meetings if possible.

4. Start meeting on time.

5. Stick to the subject - get thinking of each member before asking for a decision.

6. Talk about home interests and other personal business at lunch or after the meeting.

7. Act as a 3-man committee - chairman should not try to dominate.

The chairman should see that a clear-cut decision is made and recorded. He should also be sure field work is definitely assigned and information brought into the next meeting for action.

HOLDING BETTER COUNTY COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Preparation and Use of Minutes
Talk by Mrs. Bethany French, Rutland County Office Manager
at State ASC Conference
Burlington, Vermont, March 25, 1960

Since the purpose of the county committee meeting is to take action as the board of directors, it is very necessary that the minutes of the meeting record such action without omissions or delay.

There are four rules to follow in preparing the minutes of any meeting. They are:

1. A consistent form
2. Completeness
3. Conciseness
4. Promptness

The reason for a consistent form is for ease in finding a particular item from a meeting long past. If the minutes have an item, such as action taken on substitution of practices, one time at the beginning -- another time at the end almost as an afterthought -- it means that in referring back to the minutes one has to plow through much irrelevant material to find the action wanted. If each county would use a consistent format, it will facilitate finding information without undue delay.

Completeness should be a self-evident necessity. If we don't record the complete action taken, why bother with a record? An incomplete record of action taken at the county committee meeting is as helpful as the statement, "We had a meeting," -- period.

But just because we want to record completely all action taken, we don't have to sacrifice conciseness. To be complete the record should not and does not need to be either "wordy" or have incomplete sentences. The axiom, "Say what you mean and mean what you say," could be re-phrased for county committee minutes to, "Say what you mean - no more, no less - in a complete sentence."

The last item, "promptness," is very important both to the county committee and to the State Office. If the minutes are written up and sent out promptly, the county committee and the State Committee have an early record of what the county committee did and why. Also, the county office manager has one more job done and no longer hanging over his or her head as, "unfinished business."

(SAMPLE OF GOOD MINUTES)

MINUTES OF THE AMERICAN ASC COUNTY COMMITTEE - March 25, 1960

The county committee met at 9:00 a.m. Present were:

John Jones, Chairman	William Doe, County Agricultural Agent
George Smith, Vice-Chairman	Charles B. Doane, Fieldman
Robert Adams, Member	Bethany G. French, County Office Manager

1. Minutes - The minutes of the meeting held on February 25, 1960 were approved.

2. Unfinished Business - In reference to farm #111, Roy Black, it was reported that the 10 tons of lime furnished under the 1958 ACP was used in the 1959 program year for the practice originally approved.

3. ASC Letters - ASC letters 960 through 974 were reviewed. Necessary action was taken as follows:

   ASC-974 - Information on the Conservation Reserve - The county committee instructed the county office manager to send the above pamphlet to the banks in the county as well as the agricultural agencies and community committeemen since they, through farm loans, are interested in programs affecting the agricultural economy of the area.

4. Expenditures - The February expense accounts and 1960 fiscal year budgeted programs were reviewed.

5. 1959 ACP

   (A) The county office manager reported that 350 applications for payment had been submitted to the State Office and there remained 20 applications to be submitted.

   (B) The following farms were reported as having unused 1959 CMS materials and were placed on the list of unused materials for use in 1960: #263 - John Peters - 100-80's Pr. 2 New Seeding 0-20-20; #1406 - Leo May - 10 T Pr. 1 Liming 5A sod.

   (C) The obligation of funds for the 1959 ACP, as submitted to the State Office on 3/3/60 was reviewed by the county committee and found to be within the allocation.

   (D) The county committee reviewed and took action on the 10 farms on which practices were reported as being substantially completed as per Exhibit 1 attached hereto.

6. 1960 ACP

   (A) The county office manager reported that lime deliveries had been made as follows:

Bagged FY	- ordered 1000 T	delivered 200 T = 20%
Bulkspread	- ordered 982 T	delivered 619 T = 63%
Bag F.O.B. Plant	- ordered 1225 T	delivered 612 T = 50%

The county office manager was instructed to notify the State Office that since the delivery of bagged farmyard lime seems to be lagging, they would like to have the matter called to the attention of the supplier with a request that delivery be stepped up.

(B) It was reported that of the 1137.2 tons of 0-20-20 ordered 625 tons have been delivered as of 3/15/60.

(C) The obligation of funds - 1960 ACP, as submitted to the State Office on 3/3/60, was reviewed. It was decided that since it appeared that American County had not fully obligated funds for 1960 that the following late-filed requests would be approved:

#249 - Mrs. May Good -	Pr. 1 Liming 5 A N.S.	10T	$40.00
	Pr. 2 New Seeding 5A 8-16-16	20 cwt.	16.80
#2560 - John Jay -	Pr. 15 Open Drainage	2000 feet	$250.00

7. 1959 CRP

(A) Payments of $7609 annual rental and $7025 cost-share payments were reported.

It was reported that 12 contracts have 162 acres of tree cover still to be established. The county committee instructed the county office manager to write to the 12 farmers notifying them that since there was an ample supply of trees available from the State Nursery, they will be in violation of their contract if the remaining acreage is not established by 12/31/60. It is to be pointed out in this letter the refund or forfeiture which will result if the contract is deemed in violation.

(B) A letter dated 3/2/60 from Percy Piper explaining that he would be out of the county until May 1 requesting that the county committee meet with him concerning his violation report was read. The county committee decided that since Mr. Piper had left the county before he could be contacted concerning his violation, they would meet with him at 1:30 p.m. on May 6, 1960. The county office manager was instructed to notify Mr. Piper of their decision.

8. CCC - Wool - The county committee reviewed the register of applications for incentive payment on wool sold in the 1959 marketing year.

9. Next Meeting - The committee will meet on April 26, 1960 at 1:30 p.m. in the ASC county conference room.

The meeting adjourned at 11:45 a.m.

Signed Bethany G. French
County Office Manager

Exhibit 1 to minutes of
American ASC County Committee
Meeting held on 3/25/60

Farm No. and Name	Practice No. & Name	Year	Action Taken
43 Wallace Jones	15 Open Drainage	1959	Extended to 7/1/60
126 Charles Whalen	7 Obstacle Removal	1959	Extended to 7/1/60
328 Kenneth Cole	8 Stripcropping	1959	Extended to 7/1/60
1108 Pauline Carroll	9 Farm Pond	1959	Extended to 7/1/60
1206 Caroll Price	7 Obstacle Removal	1959	Extended to 7/1/60
1416 Robert James	7 Obstacle Removal	1959	Extended to 7/1/60
1616 Edward Wells	15 Open Drainage	1959	Extended to 7/1/60
1953 Paul Fitzgerald	9 Farm Pond	1959	Extended to 7/1/60
2126 Richard Maynes	12 Diversion Ditch	1959	Extended to 7/1/60
2727 Raymond Guyette	10 Sod Waterway	1959	Extended to 5/1/60

HOLDING BETTER COUNTY COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Summary of Panel Discussion

Talk by Charles B. Doane, Fieldman
Vermont State ASC Office
at State ASC Conference, Burlington, Vermont, March 25, 1960

If there is no more discussion, I will attempt to summarize the subject with these observations:

1. Agenda - Keep a folder in your desk in which you put, as they come to your mind, items which should be taken up at the next committee meeting. Some of these might be: items of unfinished business from the last meeting; report on action taken on decisions of previous meetings; review of status of current programs; review of expenses and the budget; reports due State office, etc. Also, check with the chairman for items he might want to have discussed. Provide a spot for miscellaneous correspondence and other items that may be brought up. Provide a copy of the agenda for persons attending the meeting.

2. Reference Material - Get together in advance any information, material, procedures, etc., that might be needed by the committee in their consideration of the agenda items. (Note to county office managers: You should have clearly in mind the points that need to be considered, both as to the problem and the applicable procedures. Prepare tabulations relating to progress and status of current programs -- ACP, CRP, and Wool.

3. Keeping to the Subject - Although this is primarily up to the chairman, there should be an understanding between him and the manager whereby the manager may tactfully direct attention back to the subject by suggestion. It is important to confine the thinking to the point and both the chairman and manager should be alert to this.

4. Minutes - They should be clear, concise and avoid ambiguity. Each item should be complete in itself. The action taken, the decision, the policy agreed upon or the recommendation made, should be stated clearly and concisely so that there can be no uncertainty of the meaning. It should be remembered that the minutes are the final records of committee action and discussions. They are the archives of program administration and will be referred to maybe many months or even a year in the future as a source of the intent of the action or policy.

CONTROL AND USE OF ACP FUNDS

Panel Discussion led by A. F. Heald, State Administrative Officer,
Vermont State ASC Office,
at State ASC Conference, Burlington, Vermont, March 25, 1960

We have just concluded a study of the use of ACP program funds in Vermont for the years 1959 and 1960. Our purpose here this morning is to discuss with you folks how we stand and what to do about it. To assist me, I have asked to have representatives of the State Committee, county committees, and county office managers present here on the panel. I would like at this time to introduce Howard Foster from the State Committee, Arthur Stancliff from the Lamoille County Committee, and John DeVito from the Bennington County Office. I will outline the facts on how we stand and then we will ask each of them to make a few comments.

I should point out that my discussion will be based on the facts submitted to us by county offices on the status of their funds as of March 1, 1960. It seemed to me the quickest way to get these facts across to you was to prepare an ASC letter and to distribute that letter here at the conference. With that in mind, I will now ask that copies of ASC-978 be distributed to the group. Attached to this letter are suggested steps to be taken in transferring approvals from the 1960 program to the 1959 program, also statements on the use of 1959 and 1960 ACP program funds.

First, I believe we should take a look at the 1959 program.

1959 ACP

It appears from the records that we will be under-obligated by $80,166. Counties should, therefore, take steps to put concurrent operations into effect and transfer 1960 approvals back to 1959 to the extent possible within program authorizations. The general rules to follow on concurrent operations are outlined in Part 6, Section 3, par. 210-214 of the ACPS Handbook. Additional information on steps to follow is included in enclosures with ASC-978. It should be noted that transfer of approvals can be made <u>only</u> when the cost-share rate for the practice is the same for 1959 and 1960.

Now, let's take a look at the 1960 program.

1960 ACP

Based on the summary attached to ASC-978, most counties should take steps to obligate additional 1960 funds. The additional amount to obligate should be based on the status of your 1960 funds after you have made transfers of approvals from 1960 to 1959 under concurrent operations.

Suggested steps to take in obligating more 1960 funds are as follows:

1. Continue to accept enrollment on those farms that have legitimate reasons for late enrollment.

2. Transfer approvals from CMS to cash practices for those farms who did not meet the deadline for their cash collections.

3. Enroll farms where new ownership is involved.

4. Work with towns on enrollment of town farms for forestry practices.

5. Review present limits to see if they should be changed.

6. Have an additional sign-up for lime and/or super.

General Comments

As previously pointed out, we are confined at the moment in the transfer of approvals from 1960 to 1959 to those practices with the same rates under both programs. We are working with the Washington Office on ways and means of making it possible to make other transfers. You will be notified at a later date as to the progress we are making.

The State Committee has discussed the possibility of changes in county allocations where a given county will release some funds because they are unable to obligate all of them. The State Committee agrees that it will be possible to do this. First, we will try to get a county that will accept some 1959 funds and release a like amount of 1961 funds. If this cannot be done, we will make the adjustment based on pro-rating the funds available among the counties that can use them.

At this time I would like to ask for comments from my panel members.

Mr. Foster

I would merely like to point out that the State Committee has spent quite a little time in reviewing this situation and wants to urge counties to take a close look at their figures back home and carry out the necessary steps to obligate them. I am sure we could use many more funds had they been made available but our guess on the casualties this year seems to be off some. That is why we are in this situation.

Mr. Stancliff

We have taken a look at our situation and want to assure the group that we can use all of our money and some more too if it is made available. We haven't yet worked out the details but we will when we get back home.

Mr. DeVito

I am sure that we can use all the funds made available to Bennington County. However, this system of concurrent operations causes a lot of extra work. There should be an easier way to do it.

There followed a general discussion from the group and several questions on detail were raised. It was agreed that the fieldmen would contact counties in the near future and work out steps to follow in making the necessary transfers.

It was pointed out that the reason we are in this situation is not because we cannot use more funds but because of the method of operation.

NEW CHALLENGES TO COMMITTEEMEN

Address by Harris W. Soule
Director, Northeast Area, CSS, USDA
at State ASC Conference
Burlington, Vermont, March 24-25, 1960

Mr. Bryant, I want to thank you for the introduction and tell you that it is my pleasure to be able to attend your conference. I feel at home with Vermont committeemen because they are a hard-working, sincere group and have done an excellent job in promoting the Agricultural Conservation Program in this State. For every dollar expended I know that you try to get more than a dollar's worth of conservation and that is a goal worth striving for.

Vermont has made an enviable record in administering the Agricultural Conservation Program. One reason for the widespread participation in ACP is the type of agriculture, largely dairying, which depends upon a grassland agriculture. A second reason is the use of community committeemen to inform farmers of the provisions of the ACP. These two factors are not present in other States to the same degree.

Al Heald and the State Committee have a perfect right to boast about the achievements of the ACP in Vermont. Speaking of boasting reminds me of a story I heard a while ago about a Vermont farmer traveling through the South on the train. Sitting near him was a large, loud Texan who finally struck up a conversation with the Vermonter. He said, "Where are you from, buddy?" The Vermonter acknowledged that he was from Vermont. The Texan said, "Well, I don't suppose you have ever been in Texas," and the Vermonter said, "Yes, I was there once." The Texan said, "Well, what do you think about it?" The Vermonter said, "Well, I'll tell you, you've got more land and less trees, more rivers and less water, more pasture and less grass, more cows and less milk and you can look farther and see less than any place I have ever been in." Well, of course, that didn't stop the Texan. Really, they say, it takes a Vermonter to stop those boys along the Rio Grande. They tell another story about a Vermont boy who got a job on a ranch in Texas about 50 miles from town. One of the cowboys was severely hurt and died and the boss told the Vermont boy that he had observed he was very versatile and wondered if he could build a casket. The boy said, "Yes, sure. He would get some lumber and build one." So the next morning he told the boss it was all ready and on inspection the boss observed a box only about four feet long and a foot square. He said, "Well, that isn't large enough for that Texas cowboy." The Vermont boy looked at him and said, "Well, Mister, I think it will be, once you get the hot air and wind out of those Texans it doesn't take a very big casket."

Yesterday I was pleased to hear Ralph Mc Williams, county agent from Franklin County, discuss his role as ex-officio member of the county committee, and I remember Mac was rather modest in saying that he didn't know how he happened to get into that position. Well, I can tell you. Back in 1936 when the Soil Conservation and the Domestic Allotment Act was passed it provided for local committees in each county and committeemen in each community. It also provided for a three- to five-man State Committee and in Vermont a five-man committee was appointed by the Secretary. In order to get the program to farmers, it was necessary to act quickly, so the State Committee asked county

agents and others for names of farm leaders who would serve on the county committee. These names were provided by county agents and the first county committees were asked to serve by the State Committee. I believe it was in 1938 that the first elections were held in Vermont. The Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, which was passed February 29, 1936, provided that county agricultural agents should be either secretary of the county committees or members ex-officio.

My topic is "New Challenges to Committeemen." Some of you fellows who have served on the county committee for a number of years know that the committeemen in Vermont, as well as other States, have been faced with challenges from the start. The first challenge was to acquaint Vermont farmers with the provisions of the Agricultural Conservation Program, as we now know it. The legislation was passed the last part of February and the State Committee in Vermont had its first meeting, I believe, the early part of April 1936. They asked the Vermont Extension Service to assist in publicizing the Agricultural Conservation Program provisions and how farmers would sign up. It was necessary, of course, to first educate farmers to accept the program inasmuch as many of them questioned whether they should accept money from Uncle Sam to carry out improved conservation practices on their farms. It was a new concept to them and, for some, much against their philosophy. A good many of the county committeemen and farmers subscribed to the philosophy of Liberty Hyde Bailey, who once stated that it was a farmer's obligation to take a farm, raise a family, educate them, contribute to community activities, the church, schools, etc., and leave the farm in better shape than when he took it. That was a noble philosophy and a good many Vermont farmers subscribed to it. However, the previous few years of depression had made it impossible for many farmers to even pay for their farms, to say nothing about adopting improved soil-building practices.

Some of you people will remember that George Dykhuizen, Professor of Philosophy at the University, met with AAA Committeemen, as they were then called, on several occasions and helped them to reconcile their thinking to accept the new program. Committeemen and farmers accepted this first challenge and their response was excellent. It is a matter of record that a higher percentage of Vermont farmers signed up the first few years than any other State.

Committeemen in those early days had a second challenge and that was to build a balanced program that would be attractive enough to farmers so they would match the government contribution to pay the cost of approved conservation measures. The second consideration was to build a program that would protect the public interest. I am sure that everyone in this room believes that the Agricultural Conservation Program, especially in Vermont, has been built to accomplish these two objectives.

Through the years, Vermont Committeemen have been faced with the challenge of administering the programs equitably. During the years there have been a number of farmers who could have used twice the amount of assistance which they could get and this has been even more true in the latter years. You county committeemen and office managers realize the difficult job you have in making a certain allocation go around equitably when you have twice, or over, the demand for funds that you

have allotted to you. I am sure that you try to treat farmers equitably and, to my knowledge, it is being done in Vermont.

One of the challenges which has come out of the Agricultural Conservation Program. the Conservation Reserve Program, the Wool Program and others which the committee system has administered is the development of local leadership. In Vermont it always has been the policy to have capable community committeemen elected and then to use them in every way possible to acquaint farmers with the program. This has been a leadership training project and has paid dividends. I pay tribute to the help of the Vermont Extension Service for the valuable assistance they have given to our State Office in this effort. It doesn't make any difference what the price level is or what farm income is in relation to other groups in our National economy, if you have good sound agricultural leadership you are bound to be in a better position than without it.

Speaking of new challenges to committeemen, I think the first challenge is to develop a positive public relations program. I'm sure all of you have had the same experience I have in reading editorials and articles which put farmers in a very poor light in the minds of their city cousins. Last fall I read an editorial in the Hartford Courant, Hartford, Connecticut, which went on to say that because the government was spending so much money on programs to benefit farmers the city people had to put up with the blight of city slums. The leading editorial in that paper on October 23, 1959, appeared under the headline "Slums Foot the Bill for Farm Prosperity."

We know that is not an isolated incident. The slick magazines and large city newspapers are always pounding away at what they consider unwarranted subsidies to farmers. The facts remain that if farmers had not been as efficient as they have been, food prices today would be twice, three times, and yes, four times as high as they are today. Then I wonder what the cry would be. However, I believe that it is your responsibility and the responsibility of everyone interested in agriculture to see that the facts are known.

The USDA budget supports many activities, not all of which are of exclusive benefit to farmers. Let me give you a general idea of the budget estimate for the USDA appropriation for the Fiscal Year 1960. The figures that I am using appear in the record of hearings before subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations. The total budget estimate for the Department for the Fiscal Year 1960 is 5,706 million dollars, of this sum 2,622 million dollars are to pay for programs predominantly for the benefit of the farmer. This sum is broken down as follows:

Agricultural Conservation Program	244 million dollars
Acreage Reserve Program	5 million dollars
Conservation Reserve Program	365 million dollars
CCC Price supports, National Wool Act and acreage allotments and marketing quotas	1,840 million dollars
Sugar Act Program	74 million dollars
Wool Act Program	94 million dollars
Total	2,622 million dollars

Now let's consider those activities of the Department which have benefits to all the people and should not be directly chargeable to farmers.

1. The programs which have a distinct and direct foreign relations or defense aspect. This includes Public Law 480 which provides for exporting surplus crops, the figure is 1,490 million dollars.

2. Another activity which benefits city consumers more than farmers is food distribution program, including commodity purchase under the program for removal of surplus agricultural commodities, school lunch and school milk. This figure is 342 million dollars.

3. Investment in REA and FHA loans, which are subject to repayment - 576 million dollars.

4. Long range programs for the improvement of agricultural resources, including research, meat inspection, disease and pest control, education, market development and services, among others - this figure amounts to 676 million dollars.

This is a total of 3,084 million dollars.

You can see that over half of the moneys requested by the Department of Agriculture will be used to pay activities which benefit all consumers and are not direct subsidies to farmers as we are sometimes led to believe.

Another new challenge to committeemen is to maintain even more positive relationships with agencies of the State Government and allied agricultural interests. I am very happy to see Elmer Towne, Commissioner of Agriculture, at the conference and to hear him talk. I'm also glad to see Merton Ashton and Colonel Kimball of the Selective Service Office, Siegfried Martinetti of the Vermont Employment Service, Leland Beebe of the State Farm Bureau, and, of course, our many friends in the Vermont Extension Service. In the past they have assisted our State Office, and the ASC State Committee in turn has tried to cooperate with them. This challenge is ever present and I know that you are meeting it.

Still another new challenge is to develop new leaders to meet the ever changing conditions facing farm programs. The other day I was talking with a college professor and asked him what he considered the best definition of a leader. I was rather pleased to have his definition and here it is. He said that he thought a leader might be defined as anyone with a following. I am sure that this is an all inclusive definition. Of course it doesn't differentiate between good and bad leaders. However, we must provide for good leaders, we must train them in order that they are able to cope with the ever new

and changing problems. For your benefit I am listing some essentials of leadership on this chart. They may not be in order but it seems to me that they are rather pertinent.

> Number 1, you will see that I have listed that a leader must be a good listener. He seeks advice and suggestions and even constructive criticism in order that he may do a better job.
>
> The second essential of leadership is to be an educator. He must have foresight, wisdom and have a following. Sometimes it is not easy to keep that following in line, as a lot of you leaders know. They are tempted either to the right or left and sometimes we see leaders take the wrong path.
>
> A leader also must be an alertor. He must be aggressive, ahead of the pack and have the ability to motivate others to help him in his tasks.
>
> A leader also must be a delegator who knows the task thoroughly and can delegate responsibility to others, always, of course, checking on the jobs to see they are done.
>
> He must be an enlightener who knows how to give orders clearly. Otherwise the people to whom he delegates responsibility will not thoroughly know what's expected of them.
>
> A leader must also be a respecter. He must be tolerant of other people's ideas, their likes and desires and he must also respect their weaknesses. In other words, he must have a high regard for human dignity.

You will note that the first letters of the words spelling out these essentials of leadership spell "leader" and I believe it amplifies the definition that I have used.

The other day I was talking with one of the people in my office and he contributed this wisdom as to what I could give you as parting advice to meet the new challenges ahead. Here it is. If committeemen will keep their ear to the ground, their eye on the ball, their shoulder to the wheel, their tongue in their cheek and their nose out of other people's business, they will be good committeemen. I pass that on to you for what it's worth and I am sure that it will help you to meet the challenges ahead.

Thank you very much. I have enjoyed being with you.

SUPPLY AND DEMAND OF FOREST TREE SEEDLINGS

Brief of Address by Albert W. Gottlieb, State Forester
at State ASC Conference
Burlington, Vermont, March 25, 1960

(Since Mr. Gottlieb spoke extemporaneously,
no copy of his talk is available)

The growing of tree seedlings at the Vermont State Nursery to meet conservation reserve planting needs has been a difficult task. Three years ago it was not possible to predict CRP participation and the actual demand. The supply of seedlings was reduced because of great losses in the new nursery due to a soil deficiency and nematodes.

The State Nursery grows seedlings under two different authorities -- Soil Bank trees, which can be planted only on Soil Bank land; and CM 4 trees which can be sold for planting under ACP or without ACP cost-sharing and can also be used on Soil Bank lands.

Availability

7,735,000	seedlings available for 1960.
2,500,000	Red Pine seedlings can be available from New York.
10,235,000	Total

4,674,000 of the 7,735,000 trees and the 2,500,000 Red Pine are available only for Soil Bank planting. This leaves 3,061,000 seedlings available for other plantings.

There are orders from 937 landowners for fall and spring plantings as follows:

	Spring 1960	Fall 1959	Total
3,344,000	for the Soil Bank land.	504,000	3,848,000
2,273,000	for the other plantings.	55,000	2,328,000
5,617,000	total trees ordered	559,000	6,176,000

The "Summary of Tree Planting Practices" compiled by A.S.C. shows 8566 acres of CRP land still to be planted. At the rate of 1000 trees per acre this calls for 8,566,000 trees. Total orders for trees to be planted this year on CRP land are 4,405,000. This leaves a balance of 4,161,000 trees to be planted. The difference may be accounted for by:

1. There is still a shortage of some species, particularly spruce.
2. Some stock from private nurseries and some wild stock is being planted.
3. Some non-resident owners have not ordered trees.
4. Some owners are not able to plant their entire acreage in one year.
5. Administrative and nursery operational problems have necessitated setting a deadline for tree orders.

The job of getting 5,617,000 trees planted in one season in Vermont is a formidable one, considering the 3-week planting period. The planting load varies considerably by counties; Windham County is planting no Soil Bank trees and Caledonia County is planting over a million trees.

The Forest Service has mimeographed a list of planting machines and services available in the State which gives the charges for planting. Copies of the list are available through the county foresters.

During the question period the following questions and answers were discussed:

Question: What will the cost of seedlings be in the near future?

Answer: The present cost to the State is about $15 per thousand which is partially subsidized by the Federal Government. It is likely the cost to the landowner will be raised in the future.

Question: What should be done in cases where Soil Bank participants are waiting for a particular species?

Answer: The Forest Service will provide a current statement on tree availability through 1961.

Question: Should the Forest Service review their recommendations of species to site?

Answer: In some cases, more than one species can be used on a particular site.

Question: Will the allotment of trees to counties be increased for 1960?

Answer: No, the deadline date for tree orders will be adhered to; administrative and labor problems will not permit this.

How to be sure and get your seedlings for planting:

1. Order early - by November 1.

2. Keep in touch with your county forester.

ASC State Conference
Burlington, Vermont
March 24-25, 1960

Program Planning Recommendations - 1961 Agricultural Conservation Program

The committee on program planning submits the following recommendations for the consideration of the full conference. For convenience, these recommendations are listed as nearly as possible in the order in which they were taken up at the county meetings.

Background Statement

These recommendations take into consideration the National agricultural situation, but particularly the situation here in Vermont.

One of the big problems in Vermont is determining how the small amount of funds that we have under ACP will be distributed to the participating farms. In this connection, note is made of the fact that Vermont leads the nation in ACP participation. We have 83% of our cropland participating compared to a National average of about 33%. The recommendations brought out in our report are made with the idea in mind of having the farmer pay a much larger share of the conservation costs than they do in some areas and in some states. Recommendations as to the cost-shares on minerals are low because we recognize the fact that we do not have adequate funds to go around and under these circumstances we believe that the farmer must pay a larger share of the cost of mineral practices.

Our recommendations are also based upon the premise that we will get the same State allocation that we had in 1960. If we get more or less funds, our recommendations might be different.

All of these points were brought to the attention of community committeemen and other participating agencies at a series of meetings just concluded in each Vermont county. The delegates at this sub-committee meeting represented the thinking at the county level. They took into consideration the action taken in their respective counties by the community committeemen and by the technical group.

Importance of Minerals to our Vermont Program

The group wants to reaffirm the position previously stated that our Vermont program is primarily designed to help establish a sod ground. Our aim in the use of minerals is not for direct production, but it is through the use of minerals that we are aiming to build up a better sod in the long run which will aid materially our conservation effort. In our area of grassland farming, the use of minerals is a must in the Agricultural Conservation Program.

Part I - Program Policies

The group discussed in detail the seven principles which were contained in the 1960 practice handbook. They took the following action in regard to these principles:

Principles Nos. 1 through 7

It is recommended that these principles be continued.

Changes to Make the Program Work Better

Under this heading the group makes the following recommendation:

The group discussed the allocation of funds at the county level from farm to farm. It discussed the control of funds from the standpoint of farm limits, adjusting cost-sharing on individual practices and individual practice limits. It was finally agreed that the system should be left up to the individual counties.

Part II - Practice Recommendations

In keeping with the above program policies, the group recommended the following in connection with the specific practices as offered under our 1960 program. In making these practice recommendations and cost-share rates, the group did so on the basis of a State allocation similar to 1960 and with the understanding that we are recommending rates and practices to be set up in the State handbook. Each county will continue to have the privilege to offer reduced rates or added practice restrictions.

Practice No. 1 - Lime

The practice should be continued as in 1960. The cost-share rate should remain on a 50-50 basis.

Practices Nos. 2 and 3

The group recommended that these practices be continued as in 1960 and that the cost-share rates be on the basis of the Government's paying 40% of the cost.

Practices Nos. 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17 and 18

Several counties recommended that there be restrictive cost-share rates on these practices. The group agreed, however, that they should be offered in the State handbook as they were in 1960 with the same cost-share rates pointing out that any county, which wants to, may place a lower rate in their county handbook.

Practice No. 5 - Planting Trees

There was considerable discussion regarding a life span for this practice. The group recommends that a life span of seventeen years be established. Same cost-share of 80% to apply, as in 1960.

Practice No. 14 - Streambank Protection

The group recommends that this practice be continued as in 1960 except that there be a larger payment on the larger trees removed. The group recommended that the State Committee work out a reasonable payment after consultation with Soil Conservation Service representatives.

Practice No. 19 - Special Conservation Practice

The group agreed that this provision should be continued in the State handbook.

They pointed out that the type of special practice to be offered in individual counties should be worked up in that county and recommended to the State Committee as provided in the procedure.

Practice No. 20 - County Conservation Practice

The group recommended that this provision be continued.

Practice No. 20(a) - Super with Manure

The group recommended that this practice be continued and that the State handbook should set a 40% cost-share rate for the Government.

Practice No. 21 - New Conservation Problems

The group recommended that this provision be continued.

New Practices

There was considerable discussion regarding the use of rock phosphates under ACP cost-sharing, as well as from an agronomic standpoint. Mr. Koger outlined the possibilities for cost-sharing, both as a separate practice, and under existing practices for P_2O_5. Win Way, Extension Agronomist, outlined the use of rock phosphates from the agronomist's standpoint. Their comments were much appreciated.

The group recommends that the State Committee explore the possibilities of paying for the P_2O_5 in rock phosphates under an ACP practice and report to the 1961 Conference.

Conservation Materials and Services

The group agreed that we should continue to furnish conservation materials and services under contract as in 1960, but they pointed out that the individual types of materials and services to be furnished in a county should be left up to the determination of that county.

The group agreed that the extent and kind of service to be furnished by purchase order should be left up to the individual county.

Soil Sampling Service

The group agreed that the extent of the use of the soil sampling service should be left up to the individual county.

Other Suggestions

The group discussed the method used for enrolling farmers in Windsor County. No recommendation was made.

The group recommended that the small cost-share increase be eliminated and Vermont's share of this fund be added to Vermont's allocation.

The group agreed that consignee fees should be raised as follows:

Super and mixed fertilizer - from 50¢ to 55¢ a ton.
Lime - from 35¢ to 40¢ a ton.

The group then recommended that the proposed increase in consignee fees be considered by the State Committee.

The group further recommended that all ACP lime, superphosphate and mixed fertilizer, furnished under contract, be supplied in 80-lb. bags.

Respectfully submitted,

Howard A. Foster
For the Program Planning Committee

C. B. Doane, Secretary

Other Members of the Program Planning Committee

Fenwick Estey, Addison County
Robert Graf, Bennington County
Norman Lowe, Caledonia County
Ray Collins, Chittenden County
Mrs. Mildred Hook, Essex County
Floyd C. Weld, Franklin County
Chester Caswell, Grand Isle County
Jay Haylett, Grand Isle County
Arthur Stancliff, Lamoille County
Ray C. Perkins, Lamoille County
F. Milo Leighton, Orange County
Glenn A. Webster, Orange County
Allen Nelson, Orleans County
George Ridlon, Rutland County
George Livak, Rutland County
D. Drew Bisbee, Washington County
Everett Walbridge, Washington County
Robert E. Gaines, Windham County
Arthur Bensenhaver, Windham County
Raymond Farrar, Windsor County
John Stephenson, Addison County Agent
Erden Bailey, Washington County Agent
William Stone, Windsor County Agent

Visitors Present

Paul Koger
A. W. Gottlieb
Robert Douglass
William Bird
Charles Winslow, Sr.
Harris Soule
Robert P. Davison
Winston Way

NOTE: This report is based on conference committee recommendations and includes the changes as adopted by the general conference.

ASC State Conference
Burlington, Vermont
March 24-25, 1960

Report of the CRP Planning Committee

The committee, considering the Conservation Reserve recommendations, first reviewed the status of the Conservation Reserve Program in Vermont to date. A tabulation of participation by counties and State totals was discussed. This tabulation indicated that to date we have 1040 contracts in Vermont on 33,959 acres of land. This represents 3.2% of the eligible acres in our State. It was further pointed out that participation in terms of acres is highest in Caledonia County with 5,390 acres. Orleans County follows with 5,083 acres. Then we get down to Windham County with the smallest acreage, having 273 acres.

It was further pointed out that under the 1960 program we ended up with 229 contracts on 8,673 acres. It was stated that, even though we felt at the beginning of the year that we wouldn't have enough money to go around, we ended up turning back about $60,000 to the Washington Office. This meant that we could have taken on more contracts had there been more applications.

The group also discussed the bidding by priority groups and the figures showing how many farms bid in each of the groups were discussed.

Community Committee Recommendations

The group then discussed the recommendations made by the community committeemen at the recent planning meetings. These recommendations together with the figures on participation to date were taken into consideration in making our recommendations for the 1961 program.

1961 Recommendations

The committee respectfully submit the following recommendations for consideration of the whole conference:

Rental Rates

The question was raised on setting the rental rates where they should be to get the desired results. The group recommended that the rental rates on the higher producing land, such as land producing 1½ to 2 tons per acre be left as it is in 1960, but that on the poorer land - the land producing 1 ton or less - the limit be set at $10.80 which would be paid if the area is to be planted to trees and would be reduced by 50% if it were not to be planted to trees.

Eligibility Requirements

The group recommended that the 1960 eligibility requirements be continued for 1961.

Bidding Procedure

The group discussed the pros and cons of requiring bidding under the Conservation Reserve Program. They went on record as opposed to bidding for 1961. Instead of this, they would recommend the first-come, first-served basis.

Practices

The group discussed the practices and recommended that they be continued as in 1960.

Identifying Farms in the Soil Bank

The group discussed various systems for making maps of farms that were in the Soil Bank. The system used in Orange County was illustrated by distributing samples of the way they have done it. The group recommended that a uniform map system be adopted for the State based on the one used in Orange County or any similar suitable system.

County and Community Ceilings

A review of the procedure followed in 1960 was made. The group recommended that the same regulations should continue for 1961.

Requirements in Regard to Mowing Hayland on Reserve Farms

The group discussed the present requirements as illustrated in the policy established by the State Committee and sent out with ASC Letter 841. The group recommended that the requirement of mowing be left optional with county committees starting with 1961 contracts. This means that, if a county committee feels that a man places land in the reserve and leaves it in hayland and he must mow it, he will be notified of this requirement at the time the contract is written. Otherwise, no such requirement can be enforced.

Checking for Violations

The group reviewed the present procedure on checking for violations and felt that it was adequate. That is, a combination of a compliance visit by the reporter plus additional visits felt necessary by the county committee is sufficient to do a good job.

Follow-up of Tree Planting

Figures were distributed on the status of tree planting. The group noted that there was a large balance of trees to be planted and voted to recommend to the State Committee that they consider allowing farmers having 1957, 1958 or 1959 contracts through the 1961 program to plant the trees.

Time of Signup

The committee recommended that signup start at least as early as it did under the 1960 program.

Type and Kind of Publicity

Under this heading, the group discussed publicity to be given in connection with violation cases. The group recommended that the type and kind of publicity be left up to the State Committee.

Soil Bank Signs

The group discussed the need for signs on farms that are in the Soil Bank. It was pointed out that farms planting trees now have signs. A motion was made that all farms should be required to have signs but the motion did not carry.

The committee wish to express their appreciation for the comments given by Marvin McLain and Harris Soule following the general discussion.

Respectfully submitted,

Clyde H. Bryant
For the CRP Planning Committee

Clyde H. Bryant, Chairman
Reginald LeBlanc, Vice Chairman
A. F. Heald, Secretary

Other Members of the Program Planning Committee

Robert C. Highter, Addison County
Frank Phelps, Addison County
Everett Lillie, Bennington County
George Ricker, Caledonia County
Clarence Burrington, Caledonia County
Gay Baldwin, Chittenden County
Raymond Rowley, Chittenden County
Robert Carlson, Chittenden County
Roland Devost, Essex County
John Boswell, Essex County
Stuart Newton, Franklin County
Roland Gervais, Franklin County
Ralph McWilliams, Franklin County
Alan Kinney, Grand Isle County
Lawrence Gregory, Lamoille County
Walter Wheatley, Orange County
Henry Dagesse, Orleans County
Reginald LeBlanc, Orleans County
Roy Burroughs, Rutland County
Emile Bordeaux, Washington County
Myron Allen, Windham County
Roy Pestle, Windham County
Matthew Watson, Windsor County
Raymond Bingham, Windsor County

NOTE: This report is based on conference committee recommendations and includes the changes as adopted by the general conference.

Visitors present

Marvin McLain
Harris Soule
Edson Gifford
Charles Winslow, Sr.
Hugh Evans

PLANS FOR GETTING STATE COMMITTEE NOMINATIONS

Discussion led by Edson E. Gifford, Chairman, State ASC Committee, at State ASC Conference, Burlington, Vermont, March 25, 1960

The group agreed that since the next State Committeeman does not take office until July of 1961, no nominations for a new committeeman should be made at this conference.

Mr. Gifford reviewed a plan to divide the State into three districts as follows:

District 1 - Orleans, Essex, Washington, Caledonia and Orange Counties

District 2 - Addison, Chittenden, Franklin, Grand Isle and Lamoille Counties

District 3 - Rutland, Windsor, Bennington and Windham Counties

Mr. Gifford pointed out that the purpose of dividing the State into districts was to have all parts of the State represented on the State Committee. He then recommended to the group that in making future nominations for the State Committee, three nominees should be selected from the district from which the retiring State Committeeman had come.

The group agreed to adopt this plan of making nominations.

The advisability of having nominating committees was discussed and it was agreed that nominating committees would not be used.

SUMMARY OF STATE ASC CONFERENCE
at Burlington, Vermont, March 24-25, 1960
by A. F. Heald, State Administrative Officer

In summing up the conference, I believe this has been one of the best ASC conferences ever. We had one of our largest banquets, and some of our best speakers. The people on the panels are to be complimented on the part they played in the conference.

We hope that the people attending the conference will review very carefully the ideas brought out here. The true measure of the success or failure of this conference will be how much we can get out of it in improving our work back home.

We urge the county committee on getting home to take an immediate look at the obligation of their program funds and to take the necessary steps to fully obligate both the 1959 and 1960 funds.

In addition to this, we hope that you will take a look at your system of holding county committee meetings and will take steps to improve them, together with the minutes that are prepared, along the lines suggested here these last two days.

OTHER CONFERENCE HIGHLIGHTS

Conference Banquet

Our guest speaker at this banquet was Marvin L. McLain, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, who presented an interesting and thought-provoking word picture of present-day agricultural problems.

The toastmaster this year was Charles L. Winslow, Sr., who retired as Chairman of the State ASC Committee last December. Mr. Winslow once again proved that any duties assigned to him will be carried out efficiently and well.

Others at the head table included:

Elmer Towne, Commissioner of Agriculture, and Mrs. Towne
H. W. Soule, Director, Northeast Area, CSS, and Mrs. Soule
Robert P. Davison, Director of Extension, and Mrs. Davison
Leland Beebe, Organization Director, Vermont State Farm Bureau Inc.
Mrs. Charles L. Winslow, Sr.
Edson E. Gifford, Chairman, State ASC Committee, and Mrs. Gifford
Howard A. Foster, State ASC Committeeman, and Mrs. Foster
Clyde H. Bryant, State ASC Committeeman

Brief remarks were made by Commissioner Towne who expressed the Governor's regret at being unable to attend and stated that the work of ASC committeemen and their programs were of great assistance to conservation in Vermont.

Leland Beebe brought to the group the greetings of the Vermont State Farm Bureau and stated that their President, Keith Wallace, was unable to attend because he already had more than one meeting scheduled for that evening. He concluded with a challenge to those present to keep up to date on current legislation being presented to the country's lawmakers.

Entertainment was provided by Loeata, Edson, and John Gifford, grandchildren of the State Chairman. Loeata and Edson played several piano duets, and then John presented a few selections on his saxophone, accompanied by his brother at the piano. Everyone enjoyed the music, and the courtesy of the Giffords in arranging for their grandchildren to be present was greatly appreciated.

There were 115 at the banquet this year, which was served buffet style once again. Because of extensive remodeling in the hotel's main dining room, the buffet was served in the Roof Garden. The beautiful floral arrangement on the head table was presented to Mrs. Gifford in appreciation of her serving as conference hostess.

State Alumni

A special table at the banquet was reserved for State alumni and their wives. The following were present this year:

Mr. and Mrs. Walter H. Beebe, Manchester)
Mr. and Mrs. Park H. Newton, Georgia) State Committee
Mr. Hugh E. Evans, Brattleboro)

Mr. and Mrs. Edward N. Blondin, Burlington) State Office

Visitors from Cooperating Offices

We were pleased that the following representatives of cooperating agencies could attend sessions of the conference:

A. W. Gottlieb, State Forest Service, Montpelier
S. M. Martinetti, Vermont Employment Service, Montpelier
Col. E. T. Kimball, Selective Service System, Montpelier
Merton E. Ashton, Selective Service System, Montpelier
L. J. Peet, Soil Conservation Service, Burlington
Adrian Gilbert, Northeastern Forest Experiment Station, Burlington
Paul R. Miller, College of Agriculture, UVM, Burlington
Thurston Adams, College of Agriculture, UVM, Burlington
Winston Way, Extension Service, Burlington
Dwight Eddy, Extension Service, Burlington

Outstanding County Office Award

Mr. Heald announced at the banquet that Windham County had been selected as the outstanding county office in 1959, based on performance during the year from August 1, 1958 through July 31, 1959.

He then presented a plaque for the office to Mae Carpenter, County Office Manager, and distributed individual citations for outstanding service and cash awards as follows:

Mae Carpenter, County Office Manager, $50
Myron W. Allen, Chairman, County Committee, $25
Robert E. Gaines, County Committeeman, $25
Arthur Bensenhaver, County Committeeman, $25

A certificate of recognition was presented to County Agent Ray Pestle honoring his years of service and helpfulness as ex officio member of the Windham County ASC Committee.

Length-of-Service Awards

Certificates and pins recognizing ten years of service were awarded to the following county office employees:

E. W. Mattison, Bennington County
Ray W. French, Essex County
Stuart A. Newton, Franklin County
Alan K. Kinney, Grand Isle County
Arthur W. Stancliff, Lamoille County
F. Milo Leighton, Orange County
D. Drew Bisbee, Washington County
Myron W. Allen, Windham County
Edla S. Browne, Addison County Office Manager

Certificate Awarded

Mr. Heald then announced to the group that a certificate and scrapbook had been presented to Charles L. Winslow, Sr., who retired last December as Chairman of the State Committee, in recognition of his years of service to the organization. The presentation, which normally would have taken place at this conference, was made at the December meeting of the State Committee since at that time there was some question about being able to hold a conference this spring.

State Office Employee Honored

Mr. Heald then announced that one of the State Office staff, Marcia Tudhope, was planning to retire this summer and would be away from the office for some time this spring as she was taking a trip to Europe.

John DeVito, Bennington County Office Manager, then presented Miss Tudhope with a gift from the county office managers in appreciation of her help to them over the years.

Newspaper and TV Coverage

During the conference photographers and local news commentators took pictures and interviewed speakers and guests. Pictures with appropriate remarks were shown over WCAX-TV as part of the day's local news and the local papers gave good coverage.

Statewide newspaper and radio coverage of the conference was excellent this year. We appreciate the fine cooperation and efforts of the Vermont Extension Service Information Office in taking care of the many details.

On March 25 Edson Gifford, Chairman, State ASC Committee, and Harris W. Soule, Northeast Area Director, CSS, presented a talk over WCAX-TV on the noon-time program, "Across the Fence," at which time they discussed the committee system used in administering ASC programs.

Exhibits

In the Roof Garden where the general sessions of the conference were held many charts and pictures pertaining to the work of the Vermont ASC committeemen were displayed. These exhibits were viewed with interest by those attending the conference, and in some instances served as background material for conference speakers.

Photography

We are once more indebted to William Stone, County Agent from Windsor County, for his courtesy in taking pictures of the various events. Were it not for his cooperation our conference records would be far less complete and much less interesting.

Special Session for County Office Managers

A special session for county office managers was held in Parlor A on the first afternoon of the conference. Representatives of the State Office staff were present to discuss various phases of the work, and time was allowed for questions and discussion on each topic.

A separate report of this session will be issued to county office managers for their reference.